DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 746 FL 024 240

AUTHOR Tamada, Yutaka
TITLE Japanese Learners' Language Learning Strategies: The Relationship between Learners' Personal Factors and Their Choices of Language Learning Strategies.
PUB DATE Aug 96
NOTE 148p.; Master's Thesis, Lancaster University, England.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Educational Environment; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Foreign Students; *Intensive Language Courses; Japanese; Language Research; *Learning Motivation; *Learning Strategies; Majors (Students); Native Speakers; *Personality Traits; *Second Language Learning; Sociocultural Patterns; Student Motivation; *Study Abroad; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Japan

ABSTRACT

A study investigated (1) whether Japanese learners of a second language have the same learning strategies as other groups previously studied, and (2) whether the experience of studying or living abroad affects learning strategy use. Subjects were 24 Japanese third-year college students, learners of English as a second language who were studying in England. Data on learning strategy choice and use were gathered from students using an inventory of language learning strategies, and from teachers using a survey of teaching strategies employed and their perceptions of Japanese students' language learning strategy preferences and use. Students were surveyed during the first and eighth weeks of an intensive English course. Results indicate some learning strategies were not used, which is attributed to: influence of English teachers in Japan; characteristics of the Japanese language; and level of English ability. Students tended not to use strategies not learned in Japan, and many had learned strategies from teachers in Japan. Learners' sex, integrative motivation, and instrumental motivation affected choice of strategies significantly, but major, personality, and proficiency did not. Experiences of both studying and living abroad also affected strategy choices significantly. Appended materials include data tables and the questionnaires in both English and Japanese. Contains 47 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 401 746

FL

ABSTRACT

M.A. in Linguistics for English Language Teaching August, 1996

Yutaka TAMADA

THESIS: Japanese learners' language learning strategies: The relationship between learners' personal factors and their choices of language learning strategies.
pp. 1-37 + App.

In this study, I investigated the following two research questions about Japanese learners' language learning strategies (LLS) choices; 1) Do Japanese learners have same LLS choices as the other students that have been investigated in the previous studies? and 2) Does the experience of studying abroad or staying abroad affect Japanese learners' LLS choices?

Twenty-four Japanese learners, who all belonged to the JYA program and took the intensive English language course, participated in this study and were asked to complete the questionnaire. Their teachers also were asked to complete the questionnaire as well.

As a result of this study, as to the first research question, it was found that learners' sex, integrative, and instrumental motivation affected their LLS choices significantly. In other words, as to these factors, Japanese learners have similar tendency to other students investigated in the previous studies. However, major, proficiency, and personality did not affect their LLS choices significantly. As to the second research question, it was found that both experience of studying and staying abroad affected Japanese learners' LLS choices significantly.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tamada

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL024240

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Roz Ivanic, for her inspiring advices and encouragement during her supervision. I would also like to thank Dr. Kenji Kitao (an academic visitor from Doshisha University in Japan) and Dr. Kathleen Kitao (an academic visitor from Doshisha women's University in Japan), for their thoughtful advices about a role of researcher and an interpretation of the data that I have collected in this study.

I would like to convey my acknowledgement to Ms. Judith Ilett, a co-ordinator of JYA programme in IELE, who supported my study and helped me whenever I had problems in my study, and also to twenty-four Japanese students in JYA programme and their teachers who helped me and contributed to my study very much. I would like to express my appreciation to all colleagues that helped and advised me.

Finally, I thank my wife for her encouragement and support during my study here.

Without their advices, help, and support, this dissertation will never come true.

Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction....1

Chapter 2: Literature Review....2
2.1 Introduction....2
2.2 Studies about defining, classifying, and listing LLS....2
2.2.1 The definition of LLS....2
2.2.2 Classification and list of LLS....4
2.3 Various factors affecting learner's LLS choice....6
2.3.1 Good language learners (GLL) study....6
2.3.2 Sex....6
2.3.3 Motivation....7
2.3.4 Career orientation....7
2.3.5 Personality....8
2.3.6 The teaching method....8
2.3.7 Cultural background and studying abroad....8
2.4 Data collecting methodology....9

Chapter 3: Research questions....10

Chapter 4: Description of research....11
4.1 Subjects and JYA program....11
4.2 Data collecting methodology in this study....11
4.2.1 Students....11
4.2.2 Teachers....13
4.3 Research procedure....13
4.3.1 Students....13
4.3.2 Teachers....15
4.4 Data analysis procedure....15

Chapter 5: Findings....16
5.1 Reliability of the questionnaire employed in this study....16
5.2 Findings in relation to the first research question....16
5.3 Findings in relation to the second research question....19

Chapter 6: Discussion....25
6.1 The first research question....25
6.1.1 General characteristics of JYA students' LLS choices....25
6.1.2 The relationship between JYA students' six factors and their LLS choices....27
6.2 The second research question....28
6.3 For further study....29

Chapter 7: Conclusion....31

Notes....32

Bibliography....34

Appendices
Appendix A: The list of LLS
Appendix B: The result of questionnaires
Appendix C: The result of Part B of the second questionnaire
Appendix D: The result of the questionnaire for teachers
Appendix E: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)
Appendix F: Questionnaires employed in the present study
F-1: The first questionnaire (English and Japanese version)
F-2: Supplementary questionnaire (English and Japanese version)
F-3: The second questionnaire (English and Japanese version)
F-4: The questionnaire for teachers

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

Only about twenty-years have past since researchers began to study language learners' language learning strategies (LLS). During these two decades, many researchers have attempted to define LLS, classify LLS, and then, find the relationship between learners' personal factors (proficiency, sex, personality, motivation etc.) and their LLS choices.

However, these studies have mainly been carried out in the United States and Canada, and the subjects were immigrants (Hispanics), learners who were studying in the United States, or French-Canadian learners who were studying English as a second language and so forth. As a result, there are very few studies which focus on Japanese learners' LLS for learning English.

It has been said for a long time that Japanese students could remember grammatical knowledge very well, but could not use English properly. It seems to me that this problem is, to some extent, relevant to learners' LLS choices, studying or living environments, and teaching methods used in Japanese schools.

In this study, as a first step to solve this problem, I will investigate the following research questions; 1) Do Japanese learners have the same LLS choices as the other students that have been investigated in the previous studies?, and 2) Does the experience of studying abroad or staying abroad affect Japanese learners' LLS choices? Chapter 2 will review some important issues about LLS study claimed by previous researchers. Chapter 3 will describe the research questions as I mentioned above in this study. Chapter 4 will introduce the subjects and research method that I will use in this study. Chapter 5 will describe the findings about my research questions. Chapter 6 will discuss the findings and suggest some issues for further study. Chapter 7, finally, will draw the conclusions.

Finally, this study has the following limitations in interpreting and drawing conclusions;

1. The number of subjects were only twenty-four Japanese students studying in JYA program. It means that the result can not be generalised for other Japanese students.
2. The data was collected from students and teachers by a multiple-choice questionnaire and a mixture of yes-no and open-ended questionnaire. Hence, there is a possibility that students and teachers could not express their thoughts and feelings completely.
3. The list of LLS used in the present study were changed a little bit from Oxford's (1990) LLS list and it has not proved by other researchers yet.
4. The findings of the present study are provisional ones and they are to be proved by other researchers.

CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Since the 1970s, many researchers have carried out their researches on LLS. Although there are some overlaps between them, it is possible to divide them into three main interests; 1) a good language learner studies (GLL studies), 2) studies on defining, classifying, and listing LLS, and 3) studies about various factors that affect learners' LLS choices.

Of these three interests, GLL was first researched, in the late 1970s. This type of study focused only on what a good language learner did and which LLS they chose in his/her language learning. These studies showed that this factor, a good language learner, affected learners' LLS choices. Judging from this result, it is possible to think that this type of study is the same as the third interest; 3) studies about various factors that affect learners' LLS choices.

Therefore, in this chapter, first, I will review some significant research about defining, classifying, and listing LLS, and explain the definition, classification, and list of LLS that I will use. Second, I will review studies about various factors that affect learners' LLS choices, including some GLL studies. Finally, I will review the methodology that has been employed by previous researchers and explain the methodology that I will use.

2.2 Studies about defining, classifying, and listing LLS

2.2.1 The definition of LLS

In LLS study, the definition of LLS is the most basic and important issue. Although LLS have been defined by several researchers (Bialystok 1978, Rubin 1987, Chamot 1987, O'Malley and Chamot 1990, and Oxford 1990), there had been no clear definition before Chamot's (1987) research. In table A, I list their definitions of LLS. As seen from table A, it is possible to divide their definitions into two factors; the elements that LLS include, and the purpose that learners use LLS for.

As to the former factor, for example, Bialystok (1978), defined it as "optional means", and Rubin (1987) as "strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affects learning directly". Judging from these definitions, it is possible to say that Bialystok's (1978) definition tells us nothing about what is "optional means", and as a result, it seems to be open to misunderstanding. On the other hand, Rubin (1987) treated it only as the action affecting learning directly, and classified the action affecting learning indirectly into other strategies, what is called "social strategies" (Rubin 1987, p. 27). Hence, it is clear that there is no agreement between both researchers about the elements of LLS.

As to the latter factor, Bialystok's (1978) definition is "to improve competence in a second language". It means that learners learn LLS only to be more proficient learners, not to learn effectively or learn easily. Rubin's (1987) definition does not tell us about this. Hence, there are also no agreement between them.

However, since Chamot's (1987) study, the definition has been changed. All three researchers (groups), Chamot (1987), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), and Oxford

(1990), defined both factors in more detail than the previous studies. Moreover, their definitions have become similar.

RESEARCHERS	DEFINITION
Bialystok, E. (1978)	language learning strategies which are defined as optional means for exploiting available information to improve competence in a second language. (p. 71)
Rubin, J. (1987)	learning strategies are strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affects learning directly. (p. 23)
Chamot, A. (1987)	learning strategies are techniques, approaches, or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning and recall of both linguistic and content area information. (p. 71)
O'Malley, J., and Chamot, A. (1990)	the special thoughts or behaviours that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information. (p. 1)
Oxford, R. (1990)	learning strategies are specific action taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations. (p. 8)

Table A Definition of LLS

For example, as to the former factor, Chamot (1987) defined it as "techniques, or approaches, or deliberate actions", O'Malley and Chamot (1990) treated it as "special thoughts or behaviours", and Oxford (1990) thought of it as "specific actions". According to Chamot (1987), and O'Malley and Chamot (1990), it is unclear about whether learning strategies are thoughts or behaviours, or both. However, as Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) indicates (I will explain it in a later chapter), it is clear that Oxford treated LLS as both thoughts and behaviours even though she defined it only as "action".

As to the latter factor, none of them mentioned the purpose of using LLS for learners as being "proficient learners", but as being able to "facilitate the learning" (Chamot 1987), "help them comprehend" (O'Malley and Chamot 1990), and "make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable" (Oxford 1990). It seems to me that, since Chamot's (1987) study, the purpose of using LLS has changed from being to become good or successful learners who speak a second language fluently, to being to become intelligent learners who know very well about how to learn a second language more successfully. In particular, Oxford's definition includes everything that second language learners need to be intelligent learners.

Consequently, in this study, I will use Oxford's definition of LLS, because my interest here is not in which LLS proficient or successful learners use, but in which LLS

general Japanese learners use. Furthermore, Oxford's definition explains more in detail than any other researcher.

2.2.2 Classification and list of LLS

Since the late 1970s, several researchers have attempted to classify and list LLS, and it is possible to divide their classifications into two categories; whether LLS include all kinds of strategies or not.

In the earlier studies on LLS, there were some strategies other than learning strategies that were relevant to second language learning. For example, Tarone (1980, p. 419) proposes two kinds of strategies such as "Strategy of Language use" and "Language Learning Strategy". In "Strategy of Language use", she introduces "Communication strategy" and "Production strategy" as follows;

Communication strategy -a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared. e.g. paraphrase, transfer, avoidance.

Production strategy -an attempt to use one's linguistic system efficiently and clearly, with a minimum of effort. e.g. simplification, rehearsal, discourse planning. (p. 419)

She also introduces "Language learning strategy" as follows;

Language learning strategy - an attempt to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language. e.g. memorisation, repetition, etc. (p. 419)

In her description, she points out the difference between "Communication strategy" and "Production strategy". For example, when learners use "Communication strategy", they choose both strategies; both avoidance to communicate and looking for alternative means to communicate with other people. However, when learners use "Production strategy", they do not choose avoidance strategy, but choose the strategy of looking for alternative means to communicate with other people. Moreover, she also points out the distinction between "Strategy of language use" (communication strategy and production strategy) and "Language learning strategy". In this case, the difference between them is only whether learners use any strategy for the purpose of communication with other people, or not. In other words, she indicates that "Strategy of Language use" (communication strategy and production strategy) is not used for the purpose of developing linguistic and sociolinguistic competence, but used for the communication purpose, and "Language Learning Strategy" is not used for the communication purpose, but for the purpose of developing linguistic and sociolinguistic competence.

Although her distinction between strategies is understandable as an idea for classifying, it is difficult to distinguish them in real life. For example, it is very difficult to say that a learner does not have any learning purpose when he/she uses a communication strategy. In other words, he/she may have both learning and communication purposes when he/she uses language, because using language is, of course, good for improving his/her language competence. Moreover, to distinguish "Communication strategy" from "Production strategy" is very difficult, because if a learner does not know about both strategies and he/she does not know about "avoidance of communication", it is impossible to divide them apart.

Therefore, Tarone's classification is well explained and divided, depending on a learner's purpose to use strategies, but sometimes it happens that a learner has more

than one purpose (e.g. communication and learning purposes) for using strategies, or does not know about which strategy is used for which purpose, and in this case, it seems very difficult to define these strategies as different ones.

In the 1980s, a new way of classification was introduced by O'Malley and Chamot (O'Malley et al. 1985a,b, O'Malley and Chamot 1990). They introduced Anderson's (1983) cognitive theory that was about how a learner processed new information. They classified, then, strategies according to the level or type of information processing such as "metacognitive strategies", "cognitive strategies", and "social/affective strategies". According to O'Malley and Chamot (1990), the three strategies are defined as follows:

> Metacognitive strategies are higher order executive skills that may entail planning for, monitoring, or evaluating the success of a learning activity. (Brown et al. 1983 cited in p. 44)
> Cognitive strategies operate directly on incoming information, manipulating it in ways that enhance learning. (p. 44)
> Social/affective strategies represent a broad grouping that involves either interaction with another person or ideational control over affect. (p. 45)

In these strategies, O'Malley et al. (1985a, pp. 33-34) list twenty-six kinds of strategies; nine for metacognitive, sixteen for cognitive, and one for social/affective[1].

In O'Malley and Chamot's classification, there are two important points. First, they treated the learning strategies as the most basic and general ones, and amended Tarone's classification in that learning strategies included all strategies (e.g. metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective). By doing so, it seems to me that problems that Tarone's (1980) classification had are resolved. In other words, each strategy has its own way of information processing, and as a result, it seems to be more clear-cut than Tarone's (1980) classification.

Second, according to O'Malley and Chamot's classification, it seems to be clear that, to some extent, all learners have purpose of the language learning when they use strategies. It seems to me that O'Malley and Chamot's classification is more realistic than Tarone's one, because whenever learners use a second language, they actually can learn something about it, or, to greater or lesser degrees, they have learning purpose to some extent.

Since the late 1980s, Oxford has developed O'Malley et al.'s (1985a) classification in greater detail. At first, she (1990) classifies two strategies in learning strategies; "direct strategies" (1990, p. 14) that affect learners' second language learning directly, and "indirect strategies" (1990, p. 14) that affect learners' second language learning indirectly. She considers the former as a "Performer" (1990, p. 14) and the latter as a "Director" (1990, p. 15), and they help and support each other. She also assesses O'Malley et al.'s (1985a) strategy list and reclassifies them into the following six categories; "memory", "cognitive", "compensation", "metacognitive", "affective", and "social" strategies, and then, defines sixty-two[2] strategies under these six categories. In her strategy list, she explains more clearly and in greater detail than any other researcher. Hence, it is possible to say that her strategy list includes almost everything that learners think or do to learn a second language.

However, even in Oxford's classifications and list of strategies, there are some problems.

First, as she admits herself (1990, p. 16), "current understanding of language strategies is necessarily in its infancy...only a proposal to be tested through practical classroom use and through research". In other words, her classification of learning strategies is not stable, and needs further research.

Second, it seems to me that there is some difficulty in distinguishing all sixty-two strategies. For example, it seems to me that the "memory strategies" must be classified as "practising strategies". It is because all "practising strategies" can be used for memorising. In other words, as Anderson (1983) states, all knowledge or skills are acquired through three stages; "cognitive", "associative", and "autonomous". In the "cognitive stage", learners memorise new information especially through practising. Hence, it seems impossible to classify "memory strategies" as different from "practising strategies".

In the discussion above, I have looked at three kinds of classifications: those of Tarone (1980), Chamot and O'Malley (1990), and Oxford (1990). As a result of considering their strength and weakness, I have decided to use Oxford's classification mainly in this study. It is, of course, neither a perfect nor stable classification and is open for adding other categories or strategies. Moreover, there are some problems of interpretation with her sixty-two strategies. However, it seems to me that her classification is more comprehensive and covers learners' thoughts and behaviours better than the any other researchers. In this study, I reclassified her "memory strategies" under the "practising strategies" and combined "selecting the topic" and "adjusting or approximating the message" strategies into one strategy (I will explain the reason in a later chapter). As a result, I made the list of LLS for this study as in Appendix A (Direct and Indirect LLS, five categories of LLS, fifteen major LLS, and sixty-one LLS)

2.3 Various factors affecting learner's LLS choice

2.3.1 Good language learners (GLL) studies

Originally, this type of study was carried out to investigate what a good language learner did in his/her language study (Naiman et al. 1978). Ellis (1994, p. 546) reviewed this study and concluded that good language learners had five major aspects to their language learning such as "(1) a concern for language form, (2) a concern for communication, (3) an active task approach, (4) an awareness of the learning process, and (5) a capability to use strategies flexibly in accordance with task requirements". However, from the point of view of the relationship between affective factors and learners' LLS choices, it is possible to think that a good language learner, who can learn a second language successfully, is one factor that affects learners' LLS choices.

In this study, I will investigate the relationship between Japanese learners' proficiency of English and their LLS choices.

2.3.2 Sex

Not so many researches about the relationship between sex and LLS choice has been carried out. However, some researchers have pointed out the significant relationship between them even in such limited studies. For example, Politzer (1983) studied learning strategies of 90 university students in the United States, and found that female students used social strategies significantly more than male students. Oxford and Nyikos (1989) investigated 1200 university students and showed that female students used four out of five strategies more often than male students. Ehrman and Oxford (1989) examined 78 university students and found that female students used four out of ten strategies more often than male students.

Judging from these studies, although it is not clear which strategy is employed by females, it is reported that female students, in general, employ a wider range of LLS than male students.

2.3.3 Motivation

Before researchers began to investigate the relationship between motivation and LLS choice, Gardner and Lambert (1972) carried out a longitudinal research on the relationship between motivation and second language acquisition.

They suggested (1972) that there were two types of motivations such as "instrumental" and "integrative" motivations. The former was defined as "the purpose of language study reflects the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement, such as getting ahead in one's occupation" (1972, p. 3). The latter was described as "if the student wishes to learn more about the other cultural community because he is interested in it in an open-minded way, to the point of eventually being accepted as a member of that other group" (1972, p. 3). As a result of their longitudinal research, they found that learners' motivation had a good effect on second language learning.

In the 1980s, researchers began to study the relationship between motivation and LLS choice. For example, Oxford and Nyikos (1989) reported the relationship between them as follows;

> the degree of expressed motivation to learn the language was the most powerful influence on strategy choice....The more motivated students used learning strategies of all these kinds more often than did the less motivated students. (p. 294)

However, it is not clear which motivation (integrative, or instrumental motivation) affects LLS choice more significantly or how motivation affects LLS choice. Further research will be required.

2.3.4 Career orientation

What learners do for a job, and what they major at university in, are also relevant to the motivation process. According to Gardner and Lambert (1972), this kind of motivation is called an "instrumental motivation".

Politzer and McGroarty (1985) studied the relationship between the field of specialisation and LLS choice, in an eight-week intensive course in ESL, in preparation for graduate study in the United States. They found that the students who wanted to study engineering/science reported using fewer LLS that were viewed as positive as opposed to the students who wanted to study social science/humanities. However, it should be borne in mind that the majority of engineering/science students were Asian students, and all of the social science/humanities students were Hispanic students. Hence, there is a possibility that this study confuses difference in the field of specialisation with the difference in students' nationalities.

Oxford and Nyikos (1989) also did a similar study. They investigated university students and divided them into three major groups; 1) technical (engineering, computer science, and physical science); 50%, 2) social science, education, and humanities; 35%, and 3) business and other; 15%. As a result of their study, there was significant difference between the three major groups in their LLS choices; the second group (social science, education, and humanities students) reported using LLS more than other groups. Ehrman and Oxford (1989) investigate the difference in LLS choice

among students, instructors (native speakers of foreign language), and professional language teachers. They found that professional language teachers reported greater use of LLS than students and instructors.

Judging from this research, it is clear that the field of specialisation and career choice can affect learners' LLS choices very much. In other words, if a student chooses social science, education, and humanities as a major, or professional language teaching as a career, he/she will use a wider range of LLS than other groups.

2.3.5 Personality

As to the relationship between personality and LLS choice, Ehrman and Oxford's (1989) study is quite comprehensive. They use the measure of MBTI (Myers-Brigg Type Indicator) and divide students into eight personality types. They found, then, that eight personality types affected students' LLS choices significantly. However, it is questionable, whether all students can be divided into only eight categories. It is necessary to further explain this categorisation of personality.

2.3.6 The teaching method

It is easy to imagine that the teaching method can affect learners' LLS choices. For example, it seems to me that the grammar-translation method helps learners to use "memory or practice strategies" (Oxford 1990, pp. 18-21), and communicative instructional methods help them to use "social strategies" (Oxford 1990, pp. 18-21). Politzer (1983) points out as a conclusion that the students' LLS choices changed according to the teaching method. Ehrman and Oxford (1989) also found that adult students who were learning a foreign language for professional reasons used communication-oriented strategies when their teachers used communicative teaching methods. Teacher's awareness of LLS choice also seems quite important for language teaching, because if they are conscious of learners' LLS choices, they can encourage them to use certain strategies more, or they can control their LLS choices according to which strategies teachers want learners to use. However, there is little research about this topic.

2.3.7 Cultural background and studying abroad

Only a small amount of research has been carried out regarding the relationship between cultural background and LLS choice. For example, Politzer and McGroarty (1985) reported as a conclusion of their study as follows;

> ...cultural background...has a great deal to do with the type of language learning behavior likely to be used by students. (p. 119)

O'Malley et al. (1985b) also pointed out the difference between Hispanic and Asian students in their strategy training in their study.

However, there is little research about the differences in the foreign language learning situation. With regard to this issue, Opper et al. (1990) have carried out very comprehensive research. They investigate study abroad programs in Europe and the United States, and the participants as well. As a result of their study, they indicate several areas of impact on participants such as academic effects, effects on foreign language proficiency, cultural impact, change in students' competence, attitudes and

views. In this impact, they pointed out the relationship between studying abroad and learners' thoughts and learning styles as follows;

> the overall range in students' views about the types of thinking and learning styles which should be important to their intellectual development...was greater than the overall range in students' post-sojourn perceptions about their actual abilities. (p. 90)

Watanabe (1990) investigated the relationship between Japanese college/university students' external factors such as entrance examination, year spent at college/university, and staying abroad, and their LLS choices. As a result of his study, he concluded that "staying overseas affected the use of the communication learning strategies" (p. 45)

Judging from these studies, it seems to me that studying abroad, including staying abroad, can be an important factor affecting learners' LLS choices as well as cultural background.

2.4 Data collecting methodology

Since the late 1970s, researchers have carried out their research on LLS with various kinds of methods; questionnaire, classroom observation, and interview. This section will introduce these methodologies and will comment on them.

First, questionnaire or self-report has been used by many researchers (Bialystok 1978, 1981, Politzer 1983, Politzer and McGroarty 1985, Reid 1987, Ehrman and Oxford 1989, Oxford and Nyikos 1989). This method is very useful especially when it is analysed statistically. However, it is difficult for learners to express their thoughts completely. It sometimes happens that "self-reported language learning behavior may...only partly reflect true behaviors"(Politzer 1983, p. 62). For example, it is impossible for learners to express their thoughts if they are not asked to answer in the questionnaire.

Second, observation method has been used, especially in the early researches (Wong-Fillmore 1979, Rubin 1981, Bialystok 1983, Chesterfield and Chesterfield 1985). It is true that this method is appropriate for learners' physical activities such as asking questions and co-operating with others. However, it is impossible to observe their mental activities such as reasoning and analysing. Hence, this method can only explain one part out of the whole learning activity.

Finally, the interview method has been used by several researchers (Naiman et al. 1978, O'Malley et al. 1985a,b, Wenden 1986, 1987). It seems to me that this method is the most appropriate method to collect information from learners, because the interviewer and the learner are in a face-to-face position, and this enables the interviewer to ask everything he/she wants to know, and if the learner does not understand the question or does not respond well, the interviewer can explain in more detail or can encourage them to answer the question better. However, the problem is that it takes a lot of time to carry out this method. Hence, this prevents researchers from using this method for many students or for quantitative research.

Since each data collecting method has its limitation, there seems to be no best method. Hence, besides using these methods independently, some researchers combine these methods to compensate for each method's disadvantage (Rubin 1981, O'Malley et al. 1985a,b). This is a better way to carry out LLS research, and if a researcher sticks to one data collecting method, he/she should try to overcome its limitation.

CHAPTER 3: Research questions

The findings of the previous research about LLS have raised two questions which are the focus of this study; 1) Do Japanese learners have the same LLS choices as the other students that have been investigated in the previous studies?, and 2) Does the experience of studying abroad or staying abroad affect Japanese learners' LLS choices?

As regards to the former question, only a few studies have been carried out (Reid 1987, Watanabe 1990). In Reid's (1987) study, the author tried to find out Japanese learners' learning style preferences, but failed to find out any significant preferences compared with students from other countries. On the other hand, in Watanabe's (1990) study, although he investigated the relationship between Japanese learners and their LLS choices, he only focused on the relationship between learners' external factors such as entrance examination, year spent at college/university, and staying overseas, and Japanese learners' LLS choices. Hence, it is still not clear how other factors with Japanese learners, such as personal factors, relate to their LLS choices. In this study, I will investigate the relationship between Japanese students' other factors and their LLS choices. In other words, I will investigate whether Japanese learners' language proficiency, sex, motivation, career orientation, and personality affect their LLS choices. According to the previous findings, it is clear that motivation affected learners' LLS choices the most. I will also investigate whether this finding applies for Japanese learners.

As regards the latter question, as Opper et al.'s (1990) and Watanabe's (1990) studies indicate in the previous chapter, there is a significant relationship between studying, staying abroad and LLS choices. In this study, I will investigate the relationship between them through asking about the difference in teaching methods or English classes between Japan and Britain, and their experience of staying abroad.

CHAPTER 4: Description of research

4.1 Subjects and JYA program

Twenty-four Japanese English learners took part in this study (see table 1.1 in Appendix B). All of them belonged to the Junior Year Abroad (JYA) program and were studying English in the Institute for English Language Education (IELE) at Lancaster University. They were from 20 to 24 years old (see table 1.2 in Appendix B) and were students in Japanese universities or just graduated from Japanese universities.

The JYA program consisted of three parts; intensive English language course (10 weeks, from April to June), study skills course (eight weeks, August and September) in IELE, and study at Lancaster University as an undergraduate student (from October to March, or to June). I investigated them when they were attending the intensive English language course. In this program, they first studied the four main skills of English (speaking, listening, writing, and reading) to improve their English proficiency, because, in general, even though all of them had studied English for more than seven years (see table 1.4 in Appendix B), they could not use English properly because of a lack of opportunity to use English in Japan. Hence, in the intensive English course, they learned how to use English in the real world. In this course, they attended twenty hours of classes a week, and learned various academic skills in addition to the four basic skills mentioned before (e.g. discussion, oral presentation, group and individual project, and project essay). Besides the classroom activities, they visited some cities or attended some lectures about British culture. Further, during this course, they stayed with a British host family to encourage them to use English even out of the classroom and to know the British culture or life.

4.2 Data collecting methodology in this study

4.2.1 Students

As to the first research question, a questionnaire has been employed as the data collecting methodology. In order to overcome the limitation of this data collecting methodology as I have mentioned in the previous chapter, Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) version 7.0 has been adopted for this study (see Appendix E). There are two reasons why I have adopted her SILL to collect the data from students.

Firstly, her SILL can collect comprehensive data about learners' LLS choices. SILL has two versions; version 5.1 and version 7.0. Version 5.1 (1990, pp. 283-291) is the questionnaire for "English Speakers Learning a New Language". In this version, there are eighty statements about LLS based on the sixty-two kinds of learning strategies introduced in her research (1990, pp. 18-21). Learners are asked to choose one from five responses about each statement (from 1 "never or almost never true of me", to 5 "always or almost always true of me"). Version 7.0 (1990, pp. 293-300) is the questionnaire for " Speakers of Other Languages Learning English". In this version, there are fifty statements (each statement of this version is shorter than that of the version 5.1) about LLS. Learners are asked to choose in the same way as in version 5.1. Even in this shorter version (version 7.0), it is possible to collect fifty kinds of information about learners' LLS choices. As far as I reviewed the literature about learning strategies, the amount of information in this version of SILL is more than that of any other researchers' questionnaires. For example, Bialystok's (1978, 1981)

questionnaire had twelve questions about eight learning strategies. Politzer's (1983) questionnaire had fifty-one statements, but it was not clear whether these statements had something to do with the learning strategies, because these statements were not about learning strategies, but about general learning behaviours, classroom behaviours, and interactions with others outside of class. Politzer and McGroarty's (1985) questionnaire had thirty-six statements about classroom behaviours and learning behaviours during individual study. Reid's (1987) questionnaire had thirty statements about six learning styles such as visual, auditory, kinethetic, tactile, group learning, and individual learning.

Secondly, Oxford's SILL version 7.0 (1990) is especially for "Speakers of Other Language Learning English" and is translated into several languages such as Chinese, Japanese, and Spanish (1990, p. 255). Hence, it is possible to say that this questionnaire is appropriate for Japanese learners. Therefore, her SILL was adopted in this study.

However, even in this version of SILL, there are three problems. First, according to this version of SILL, it is impossible to collect information about all of her sixty-two LLS. This is because there are only fifty statements in this questionnaire, in addition, there are some statements that include more than one strategy, or some statements that include the same strategy. For example, statement No. 14 in her SILL version 7.0 "I start conversations in English" can represent the strategy of "practising naturally" in her sixty-two strategies, and No. 15 "I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English." can also represent the same strategy as No. 14. On the other hand, No. 24 in her SILL version 7.0 "To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guess." can include both the strategies "guessing using linguistic clues" and "guessing using other clues" in her strategies. Hence, it is necessary to add extra statements to get all the kinds of LLS.

Second, even in this version, it is difficult for Japanese learners to understand the statements clearly, because normally learners are not conscious about their learning strategies. As a result, they sometimes do not know clearly what they do in their learning.

In order to solve these two problems, I added twenty-two statements, deleted eleven statements because of overlaps, changed the expression of thirty-three statements, and finally, translated all statements into Japanese. Consequently, sixty-one statements corresponding to sixty-one LLS were ready for the questionnaire for students (see Appendix F-1). The reason why one strategy was missed was that it was difficult for the students to distinguish "selecting the topic" strategy from "adjusting or approximating the message" strategy of Oxford's sixty-two strategies. Hence, these two LLS were combined into one strategy and one statement.

Third, in this version, the choice of response is rather vague, because it is difficult for learners to measure the degree of truth. Hence, I changed the choice of response from the degree of truth to the degree of frequency (from 1 "I never or almost never do it" to 5 "I always or almost always do it") to help them to respond more easily.

As to the second research question, the Oxford's (1990) SILL and a mixture of yes-no and open-ended questionnaire were employed. The reason why these two questionnaires were employed are as follows. Her SILL was adopted because of the same reason as I mentioned above, and implemented again at the end of the intensive English language course to compare the difference in learners' LLS choices. However, this was not enough for finding the relationship between teaching method or study (staying) abroad and their LLS choices. It was necessary for them to write down the concrete reason why their LLS changed, and also, explain the differences and

similarities in the teaching method used in English classes in Japan and in the intensive English language course. Hence, a mixture of yes-no and open-ended questionnaire was adopted to supplement her SILL (see Appendix F-3).

4.2.2 Teachers

Teachers in the JYA programme were asked to answer the questionnaire as well. There were four native English teachers who were working in the intensive English language course, and they had taught Japanese students English for ten weeks.

A mixture of yes-no and open-ended questionnaire was employed for them, to find the relationship between their teaching methods and Japanese students' LLS choices (see Appendix F-4). In this questionnaire, they were asked to say the teaching methods used in the class, the reason why they used the specific teaching methods, what sorts of LLS they thought Japanese students used, and whether students changed their LLS or learning styles, or not. The main reason why this questionnaire was employed was to give them an opportunity to express their thoughts or feelings as much as possible.

4.3 Research procedure

4.3.1 Students

Students were asked to complete the questionnaire twice to compare their LLS choices; in the first week and in the eighth week of the intensive English language course.

The first questionnaire was implemented on the twenty-sixth of April (see Appendix F-1), just after they arrived at Lancaster; in the first week of the intensive English language course. By implementing the questionnaire at this time, it was possible to collect the data about their LLS used in Japan without any influences from staying or studying abroad. This questionnaire consisted of two parts; background questionnaire and LLS choice questionnaire.

Firstly, they were asked to answer about their background such as name, age, sex, nationality, proficiency (score of TOEFL), major at their universities, duration of their English study, feeling about their proficiency of English (from "Excellent" to "Poor") compared with both Japanese students and native speakers, feeling about the importance of being proficient in English (from "Very important" to "Not so important"), personality ("Sociable" or "Not sociable"), motivation, and other languages that they had learned before. After collecting data from students, their major were divided into three groups according to the field of specialisation; 1 = Management/Economics, 2 = Law/Sociology/Politics/International relations, and 3 = Linguistics/English literature/American culture.

As I explained in the previous chapter, sex, score of TOEFL (proficiency of English), major, motivation, and personality were mainly analysed with SPSS to find the relationship between these factors and students' LLS choices. Other factors were analysed to find general characteristics of Japanese students who participated in the present study.

Second, they were asked to respond the sixty-one statements about LLS with multiple choice (from 1 "I never or almost never do it" to 5 "I always or almost always do it"). Each statement represented one strategy and these sixty-one statements were grouped into fifteen major strategies (see Appendix A). In order to avoid any

confusion, instruction in Japanese was given before the questionnaire. After both questionnaires were completed, students were given the questionnaire sheets and were advised to keep them and use them if they wanted.

However, after this first questionnaire was collected, three problems were found. First, the question about personality was not appropriate for analysis. In this question, the degree of sociability was chosen as the factor of personality, because as I mentioned before, it was very difficult to divide students' personality into some categories. However, they were only asked whether they were sociable or not. It made it impossible for me to know how sociable they were.

Second, the question about motivation was not appropriate for analysis, either. Students were only asked to tick all the reasons that applied for why they learned English (four reasons were relevant to the integrative motivation, three reasons were relevant to the instrumental motivation, and other reasons). Hence, it was impossible to know how much they agreed with these reasons.

Third, the first questionnaire lacked the questions about other strategies used by students, and how they learned the strategies that they used.

In order to make up for these problems, a supplementary questionnaire was carried out on the sixth of May (see Appendix F-2). In this questionnaire, firstly, students were asked the degree of sociability (from 1 "not sociable at all" to 5 "very sociable"). Secondly, they were asked for the reasons why they learned English, but this time, they were asked to select the degree of agreement (from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree"). Further, the number of questions were changed from eight to seven (three questions related to integrative motivation, three questions related to instrumental motivation, and one question was about other reasons). Thirdly, they were asked about other strategies that they had ever used, and how they learned the strategies that they used.

The second questionnaire was implemented on the twelfth of June, in the eighth week of the intensive English language course, to find the relationship between teaching method, studying and staying abroad, and their LLS choices (see Appendix F-3). It was possible to do it in the ninth or tenth week, but the timing was not so good. For example, they did not want to do the questionnaire in the tenth week, because they had finished most of their work in this course by the tenth week and wanted to feel free from studying or anything that was relevant to study. Hence, it was not expected that they would complete the questionnaire seriously. Moreover, it was not good timing to do the questionnaire in the ninth week, either, because they were very busy in completing their project essays, as the deadline was at the end of this week, and they could not afford to do it.

Therefore, the eighth week was the best timing for the students to do the questionnaire effectively.

The second questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part was exactly the same as the questionnaire about LLS that had been implemented in the first week. The second part was a mixture of yes-no and open-ended questions about what happened in their LLS choices in these eight weeks. They were asked to write down whether their LLS had changed or not, and if they changed their LLS, they were also asked to write down the reasons. Furthermore, they were asked to explain the teaching method used in the English class in Japan and in the intensive English language course to find the differences and similarities of teaching methods in both classes.

4.3.2 Teachers

Teachers were asked to complete a mixture of yes-no and open-ended questions about the relationship between teaching method and the students' LLS (see Appendix F-4). This questionnaire was handed out to them in the eighth week to find what happened to students' LLS. As well as students, it was not good timing to ask teachers to complete the questionnaire in the ninth and tenth week, because they were very busy in marking their students' project essays in these two weeks. This questionnaire was collected on the following Wednesday.

4.4 Data analysis procedure

Data analysis has been carried out in the following steps. The first research question is: Do Japanese learners have the same LLS choices as the other students that have been investigated in the previous studies? To answer this, I undertook 1) analysis of the description of background questionnaire such as learners' sex, age, duration of studying English, learners' self-report about their proficiency of English compared with other Japanese learners and native speakers of English, the degree of importance of being proficient in English, whether they enjoy learning English or not, and other languages that learners have learned (see Appendix F-1), 2) looking at the frequency of sixty-one LLS used by learners (see table 2.6 in Appendix B), and 3) looking at the significance of relationship between learners' six factors (i.e. sex, proficiency; score of TOEFL, career orientation; major at university in Japan, two kinds of motivation; integrative motivation and instrumental motivation, and personality; the degree of sociability) and their fifteen major LLS choices (these fifteen major LLS were defined based on the Oxford's (1990) LLS list, see Appendix A) through Pearson's correlation analysis and Analysis of variance (ANOVA) (see tables 3.1-3.37 in Appendix B). Pearson's correlation analysis was employed to find the relationship between learners' proficiency, two kinds of motivation, and personality and learners' LLS choices. ANOVA was used to find the relationship between learners' sex and career orientation and learners' LLS choices. The way of analysis was decided whether each factor was divided into clear labels (ANOVA), or not (Pearson's correlation analysis).

The second research question is: Does the experience of studying abroad or staying abroad affect Japanese learners' LLS choices? To answer this, I undertook 1) looking at the changes in the frequency of sixty-one LLS used by learners in the intensive English language course (see table 2.6 in Appendix B), 2) looking at the significance of difference in learners' fifteen major LLS choices between in the first and eighth week of the intensive English language course through t-test (see table 5 in Appendix B), 3) looking at the significance of relationship between learners' six factors and difference in their fifteen major LLS choices through Pearson's correlation analysis (the relationship between learners' proficiency, two kinds of motivation, and personality and their LLS choices) and ANOVA (the relationship between learners' sex and career orientation and their LLS choices) (see tables 6.1-6.35 in Appendix B), 4) analysis of the reasons about learners' change of LLS choices in the intensive English language course (Appendix C), and 5) analysis of the comments by teachers who worked in the intensive English language course (see Appendix D).

Finally, in the questionnaire conducted in this study, all of learners and teachers completed the questions and no missing data was collected.

CHAPTER 5: Findings

5.1 Reliability of the questionnaire employed in this study

Before looking at data in detail, the internal consistency reliability of the questionnaire employed in this study was calculated and measured by Cronbach's alpha. It was .83 for twenty-four learners. According to Cramer (1994), "an alpha of .80 or higher is generally thought to indicate an acceptable level of internal reliability" (p. 278). Hence, it is possible to say that the questionnaire employed in the present study is reliable.

5.2 Findings in relation to the first research question
- All tables are in Appendix B.

a) General characteristics of JYA students.

Judging from the results of background questionnaire, it is possible to say that JYA students have confidence that their English ability is superior compared with other Japanese students, but, at the same time, that it is inferior compared to native speakers of English. Table 1.5 shows that two thirds of them feel superiority to other Japanese students in their proficiency of English; they answered "Good" or "Excellent" in their proficiency of English compared with other Japanese students. In contrast, as table 1.6 shows, more than two thirds of them have inferiority to native speakers of English in their proficiency of English. Most of them reported that they felt it was important to be proficient in English (see table 1.7); fourteen of twenty-four students answered "important" and ten out of twenty-four students answered "very important", and enjoyed English learning in Japan (see table 1.8); twenty-one out of twenty-four students answered "enjoyed". Further, they learned other languages as well. The average number of languages other than English that they learned was 1.33 (see table 1.9).

In addition to the result of background questionnaire, table 2.6 shows that there are some features of JYA students' LLS choices. In particular, the statements that the majority of students reported using at the "1" (I never or almost never do it) and "5"(I always or almost always do it) level of frequency can indicate some characteristic features. Note that, as I mentioned in the previous chapter, sixty-one statements in the first questionnaire correspond to sixty-one strategies based on Oxford's (1990) LLS (see Appendix A).

First, there were nine statements in the first questionnaire that the majority of them used at the "1" level of frequency. Statement No. 5 was about "semantic mapping" strategy, and 54.2% of JYA students chose "1" for it. Statements No. 6 was about "using keywords" strategy and 62.5% of them chose "1" for it. Statement No. 9 was about "using physical response or sensation" strategy, and 58.3% of them chose "1" for it. Statement No. 33 was about "coining words" strategy, and 58.3% of them chose "1" for it. Statement No. 37 was about "delaying speech production to focus on listening" strategy, and 79.2% of them chose "1" for it. Statement No. 47 and 48 were about "using music" and "using laughter" strategies, and 54.2% and 70.8% of them chose "1" for these strategies. Statement No. 53 and 54 were about "using checklist" and "writing a language learning diary" strategies, and 70.8% and 58.3% of them chose "1" for these strategies.

Second, there were six statements that the majority of JYA students used at the "5" level of frequency. For example, statement No. 19 and 25 were about "analysing expression" and "highlighting" strategies, and 50% and 58.3% of JYA students chose "5" for these strategies. Statement No. 34 was about "using a circumlocution" strategy, and 62.5% of them chose "5" for it. Statement No. 43 was about "seeking practice opportunities" strategy, and 58.3% of them chose "5" for it. Statement No. 51 was about "rewarding yourself" strategy, and 50% of them chose "5" for it. Statement No. 56 was about "asking for clarification or verification" strategy, and 54.2% of them chose "5" for it.

b) The relationship between JYA students' Sex and their fifteen major LLS choices (ANOVA analysis)

As seen from tables 3.1-3.16, some significant differences in LLS choice between male and female students were indicated. For example, there were two out of fifteen major LLS that showed significance at the .05 level; "Creating structure for input and output" strategy and "Taking your emotional temperature" strategy. The former strategy showed that the mean of frequency of LLS used by male students was 3.0320 and that of female students was 3.8557, F value = 11.4628, and Significance = .0027. The latter strategy showed that mean of frequency of LLS used by male students was 1.7000 and that of female students was 2.2679, F value = 5.5862, and Significance = .0274. Hence, these two major LLS are chosen by female students significantly more frequently than male students. Moreover, there were three major LLS that showed the possibility of significance of females using them more frequently than males at .05 level; "Reviewing and sending messages" strategy, "Asking questions" strategy, and "Co-operating with others" strategy. The significance level of each strategy was .0627, .0642, and .0579 in turn.

Therefore, to some extent, sex difference can affect LLS choice for Japanese students.

c) The relationship between JYA students' Proficiency and their fifteen major LLS choices. (Correlation analysis)

According to table 3.17, only one significant relationship between JYA students' proficiency and their fifteen major LLS choices was discernible at the .05 level. It was the "Empathising with others" strategy that correlated significantly with learners' score of TOEFL; Correlation coefficient = .4471, Significance = .029. That is to say that the higher score they got for TOEFL test, the more frequently they used this strategy. In addition, there were two major LLS whose correlations were approaching the .05 level of significance; "Reviewing and sending messages" and "Taking your emotional temperature" strategies. The significance level of each strategy was .054 and .052 in turn. However, as to the latter strategy, the correlation coefficient was -.4011. Hence, it correlated negatively with learners' proficiency at the nearly significant level. The results shows, therefore, that there is only a weak relationship between JYA students' proficiency of English and their fifteen major LLS choices.

d) The relationship between JYA students' Major and their fifteen major LLS choices. (ANOVA analysis)

According to tables 3.18-3.33, only one significant relationship between JYA students' major at university and their fifteen major LLS choices was pointed out at the .05 level of significance. It was the "Taking your emotional temperature" strategy; mean of frequency of LLS used by Management/Economics students was 1.8000, that of Law/Sociology/Politics/International relations students was 1.7500, and that of Linguistics/English literature/American culture students was 2.4722, F value = 4.5504, and Significance = .0228. Further, in order to investigate the relationship among these three kinds of students, Scheffe's test was employed (significance level is .05). As a result, Linguistic/English literature/American culture students indicated significant difference from the other two kinds of students. In other words, Linguistic/English literature/American culture students used this strategy more frequently than other students. Besides this strategy, the "Encouraging yourself" strategy was used differently according to their major at the nearly .05 level of significance; mean of frequency of LLS used by Management/Economics students was 2.1340, that of Law/Sociology/Politics/International relations students was 2.9000, and that of Linguistics/English literature/American culture students was 3.4456, F value = 3.1065, Significance = .0658. However, in general, this result shows a weak correlation between JYA students' major and their fifteen major LLS choices.

e) The relationship between JYA students' Integrative motivation and their fifteen major LLS choices. (Correlation analysis)

As seen from table 3.34, there were four out of fifteen major LLS that correlated with JYA students' integrative motivation at the .05 level of significance. "Reviewing and sending message" strategy (correlation coefficient = .6179, P = .001), "Centring your learning" strategy (correlation coefficient = .4799, P = .018), "Evaluating your learning" strategy (correlation coefficient = .4994, P = .013), and "Empathising with others" strategy (correlation coefficient = .4355, P = .033). Further, the following three major LLS correlated with learners' integrative motivation nearly at the .05 level of significance; "Practising" strategy (correlation coefficient = .3908, P = .059), "Guessing intelligently" strategy (correlation coefficient = .3797, P = .067), and "Arranging and planning your learning" strategy (correlation coefficient = .3672, P = .078). Therefore, it is possible to say that about half of fifteen major LLS correlate with learners' integrative motivation at the significant level, or nearly significant level.

f) The relationship between JYA students' Instrumental motivation and their fifteen major LLS choices. (Correlation analysis)

As table 3.35 presents, two out of fifteen major LLS correlated with JYA students' instrumental motivation at the .05 level of significance; "Lowering your anxiety" strategy (correlation coefficient = -.4804, P = .017) and "Empathising with others" strategy (correlation coefficient = .4156, P = .043). However, note that the former strategy negatively correlated with their instrumental motivation. Therefore, compared with the integrative motivation, the relationship between JYA students' instrumental motivation and their fifteen major LLS choices is weak.

g) The relationship between JYA students' Personality and their fifteen major LLS choices. (Correlation analysis)

Judging from table 3.36, there was no significant relationship between the degree of sociability they reported and their fifteen major LLS choices at .05 level of significance. The only one major LLS that correlated nearly significantly was "Overcoming limitation in speaking and writing" strategy (correlation coefficient = -.3649, P = .080), but this correlation was a negative one.

Finally judging from the findings above, in this study it was found that integrative motivation affected JYA students' fifteen major LLS choices more than any other factor.

h) Findings from the supplementary questionnaire

As table 4 shows, JYA students were asked to describe other strategies that they used in Japan and answer from whom they learned learning strategies that they used. As to the other strategies that they used in Japan, it was found that 35% of learners (nine out of twenty-four students) reported that they used strategies that were not in the first questionnaire, and they reported eight kinds of strategies; reading English passages (two students), doing group work (one student), writing unfamiliar words several times and reading them (one student), practising the pronunciation of new words in the context (one student), going to a movie in English (one student), organising the unfamiliar words within the semantic group (one student), singing English songs (one student), and talking with native speakers (one student). As to the ways of learning the LLS, nineteen out of twenty-four students reported that they learned them by themselves, thirteen students learned them from teachers, and twelve students learned them with study-aid books (most of them answered two or three ways of learning).

5.3 Findings in relation to the second research question
-All tables are in Appendix B

a) JYA students' preference in sixty-one LLS

As seen from table 2.6, there were some preferences in sixty-one LLS by JYA students. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, the statements that the majority of them reported using at the "1" and "5" level of frequency can indicate some characteristic features, and sixty-one statements correspond to sixty-one LLS.

As first, there were eight statements in the second questionnaire that the majority of them chose at the "1" level of frequency; No. 6 "using keywords" strategy (70.8%), No. 9 "using physical response or sensation" strategy (58.3%), No. 10 "using mechanical techniques" strategy (54.2%), No. 33 "coining words" strategy (58.3%), No. 37 "delaying speech production to focus on listening" strategy (79.2%), No. 47 "using music" strategy (62.5%), No. 48 "using laughter" strategy (91.7%), and No. 53 "using checklist" strategy (91.7%). However, seven out of eight strategies that the majority of them used at the "1" level of frequency were the same ones as they answered in the first questionnaire.

On the other hand, the statements that the majority of them chose at the "5" level of frequency were very different from the results of the first questionnaire. There were eight strategies that more than fifty percent of them used at the "5" level of frequency;

No. 15 "practising naturally" strategy (66.7%), No. 21 "translating" strategy (58.3%), No. 25 "highlighting" strategy (62.5%), No. 34 "using a circumlocution or synonym" strategy (75.0%), No. 36 "paying attention" strategy (54.2%), No. 43 "seeking practice opportunities" strategy (66.7%), No. 44 "self monitoring" strategy (66.7%), and No. 45 "self-evaluating" strategy (58.3%). Five (No. 15, 21, 36, 44, and 45) of these eight strategies were not used at the "5" level of frequency by the majority of them in the first questionnaire, and three strategies (No. 19, 51, and 56) which were used at the "5" level of frequency by majority of them in the first questionnaire were not used very much in the second questionnaire.

b) Changes in the frequency of fifteen major LLS that JYA students used. (t-test)

As seen from table 5, JYA students used six out of fifteen major LLS significantly more frequently in the eighth week than in the first week of the intensive English language course; "Reviewing and sending messages" strategy (mean of frequency in W1 = 3.2917, mean of frequency in W8 = 3.8750, t-value = -4.16, 2-tail significance = .000), "Overcoming limitation in speaking and writing" strategy (mean of frequency in W1 = 3.2088, mean of frequency in W8 = 3.4225, t-value = -2.26, 2-tail significance = .034), "Arranging and planning your learning" strategy (mean of frequency in W1 = 3.4588, mean of frequency in W8 = 3.7429, t-value = -2.44, 2-tail significance = .023), "Evaluating your learning" strategy (mean of frequency in W1 = 4.0417, mean of frequency in W8 = 4.5625, t-value = -4.03, 2-tail significance = .001), "Taking your emotional temperature" strategy (mean of frequency in W1 = 2.0313, mean of frequency in W8 = 2.4063, t-value = -2.58, 2-tail significance = .017), and "Co-operating with others" strategy (mean of frequency in W1 = 2.9167, mean of frequency in W8 = 3.6667, t-value = -3.49, 2-tail significance = .002). Moreover, there is a possibility that they used "Guessing intelligently" strategy significantly more frequently in W8 than in W1; mean of frequency in W1 = 3.6875, mean of frequency in W8 = 4.0625, t-value = -1.89, 2-tail significance = .071.

In contrast, they used "Asking questions" strategy significantly less frequently in the eighth week than in the first week; mean of frequency in W1 = 3.4792, mean of frequency in W8 = 3.1458, t-value = 2.19, 2-tail significance = .039. In addition, there is a possibility that they used "Practising" strategy significantly less frequently in the eighth week than in the first week; mean of frequency in W1 = 2.8092, mean of frequency in W8 = 2.6363, t-value = 1.78, 2-tail significance = .088.

In total, there is a possibility that they changed their LLS choices significantly in nine out of fifteen major LLS.

c) The relationship between JYA students' Sex and changes in the frequency of fifteen major LLS that they used. (ANOVA analysis)

Judging from tables 6.1-6.15, two our of fifteen major LLS showed a significant relationship between JYA students' sex and changes in the frequency of their fifteen major LLS choices; "Reviewing and sending messages" strategy (mean of difference in frequency of LLS used by male = 1.0500, and that of female = .2500, F-value = 11.5681, Significance = .0026) and "Creating structure for input and output" strategy (mean of difference in frequency of LLS used by male = .6010, and that of female = -.0714, F-value = 5.1305, Significance = .0337). Further, "Co-operating with others" strategy correlated with their sex at the nearly significant level; mean of difference in

frequency of LLS used by male = 1.2000 and that of female = .4286. F-value = 3.4669, Significance = .0760.

Hence, it is possible to say the relationship between JYA students' Sex and their change of fifteen major LLS choices is not strong.

d) The relationship between JYA students' Proficiency and changes in the frequency of fifteen major LLS that they used. (Correlation analysis)

As seen from table 6.16, no significant relationship was found between JYA students' proficiency of English and changes in the frequency of their fifteen major LLS choices. However, it was found that the relationship between the following two major LLS and their proficiency was approaching at the .05 level of significance; "Practising" strategy (correlation coefficient = -.3662, P = .078) and "Taking your emotional temperature" strategy (correlation coefficient = .3515, P = .092). It means that the relationship between JYA students' Proficiency and changes in the frequency of their fifteen major LLS choices is not strong as well.

e) The relationship between JYA students' Major and changes in the frequency of fifteen major LLS that they used. (ANOVA analysis)

As tables 6.17-6.31 show, neither a significant nor nearly significant relationship was found.

f) The relationship between JYA students Integrative Motivation and changes in the frequency of fifteen major LLS that they used. (Correlation analysis)

According to table 6.32, it was found that there was only one significant relationship between their integrative motivation and changes in the frequency of their fifteen major LLS choices. It was the "Evaluating your learning" strategy; correlation coefficient = -.4822, P = .017. However, there was a negative relationship between them.

g) The relationship between JYA students' Instrumental Motivation and changes in
the frequency of fifteen major LLS that they used. (Correlation analysis)

As table 6.33 shows, neither a significant nor nearly significant relationship was found.

h) The relationship between JYA students' Personality and changes in the frequency of fifteen major LLS that they used. (Correlation analysis)

As seen from table 6.34, there was no significant relationship between their degree of sociability and changes in the frequency of their fifteen major LLS choices. However, one strategy correlated with their degree of sociability at nearly significant level even though this correlation was negative ; "Evaluating your learning" strategy (correlation coefficient = -.3700, P = .075).

i) The result of the questionnaire about the change of JYA students' LLS choices. (Appendix C)

According to Appendix C, JYA students reported their change of LLS choices as follows.

First, 87.5% of them (twenty-one out of twenty-four students) answered "a) has changed very much" or "b) has changed a little bit". It means that most of them changed their LLS choice in the intensive English language course. However, note that most of them (seventeen out of twenty-one students) chose "b) has changed a little bit".

Second, as to how they changed their LLS choices, sixteen out of twenty-one students reported that they changed the way of coping with the problem which they came across in their English study; "began to write down the unfamiliar words and look up the dictionary" (nine students), "began to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words" (six students), and "began to ask native speakers for help" (one student). Thirteen out of twenty-one students reported that they began to study with other students or native speakers; "sometimes began to speak English even with Japanese friends" (six students), "began to speak with native speakers" (three students), "began to study with other students" (three students), and irrelevant answer (one student). Twelve out of twenty-one students answered that they had changed their attitude in class; "began to speak English more in the class" (five students), "began to prepare for the class" (three students), "began to pay much more attention in the class" (two students), "began to review the class" (one student), and "began to participate in the class with clear object" (one student).

Third, as to the reason why they changed their LLS choices, fifteen out of twenty students reported a change of living or study environment as the reason; "began to use English much more here" (eight students), "began to plan or organise what to study" (three students), "began to be more positive" (one student), "began to feel inferior because other students could speak English better than me" (one student), "began to have a clear goal" (one student), and irrelevant answer (one student). In addition, ten out of twenty students reported the difference in teaching methods between the intensive English language course and Japanese schools as the reason; "began to contribute more in the class" (five students), "began to use English more in the class" (four students), and irrelevant answer (one student). Two out of twenty students reported other reasons; "everything helped me to improve my English ability" (one student) and "living and study environment was very different from Japan (one student).

On the other hand, three students reported that they did not change their LLS choices at all. They answered with reasons as follows; "Because the learning strategy that I used in Japan is suited to me" (two students), and "Because the learning strategy that I used in Japan is suited to this school" (one student).

Fourth, they reported the differences between classes in Japan and classes in the intensive English language course as in table B. Table B indicates big differences between English classes in Japan and the intensive English language course. For example, there were more students in one class in a Japanese school (35.7 students) compared with the intensive English language course (24 students). Further, in Japan, English teachers did not use English very much (sixteen out of twenty-four students reported that their English teachers used English less than fifty percent in the class). Judging from the result showed in table B, both factors, the big class size and small proportion of English used by English teachers, made students utter less in the class

Table B The difference between the class in Japan and the class in the intensive English language course.

	Japan	intensive English language course
number of the students in one class	35.7 students (MEAN)	24 students
number of the students in one group	4.7 students (MEAN)	8 students
the proportion of English used by a teacher in the class	0~25% 9 students 26~50% 7 51~75% 4 76%~ 4 TOTAL 24	100% 24 students
the proportion of utterances by students (including both English and Japanese)	0~25% 10 26~50% 10 51~75% 2 76%~ 2 TOTAL 24	0~25% 2 26~50% 7 51~75% 8 76%~ 7 TOTAL 24
the proportion of utterances in English in the class	0~25% 15 26~50% 2 51~75% 3 76%~ 4 TOTAL 24	0~25% 0 26~50% 2 51~75% 0 76%~ 22 TOTAL 24

(twenty out of twenty-four students uttered both in Japanese and English less than fifty percent in the class), and further, made students use English less in the class (seventeen out of twenty-four students used English less than fifty percent of their total utterance in the class). It is because the class size (much bigger than the class in the intensive English language course) makes it difficult for students to utter in the class, and the small proportion of English used by English teachers makes it difficult for them to encourage students to use English in the class. Therefore, it is very difficult for students to use English properly in English classes in Japan.

Finally, they reported the difference in teaching methods between them clearly. For example, as to the English class in Japan, ten out of twenty-four students reported it as "translate the English book into Japanese", only two students answered it as "discussion" or "discussion or presentation". On the other hand, as to the class in the intensive English language course, fourteen out of twenty-four students described it as "read the article and summarise it and then, discuss it".

j) The result of the questionnaire for teachers

As seen from Appendix D, in the questionnaire for teachers in the intensive English language course, two teachers reported that they used a sort of communicative method, and then, they described the reason as trying to allow students to use English, do the activity using English, and communicate with each other in English. Moreover, all four teachers mentioned the characteristics of JYA students' LLS choices as "are used to teacher led activities" (two teachers), "dictionary dependent" (two teachers), and "note down frequently" (two teachers) (including overlaps). As a result of their attempt to

encourage students to use a specific LLS, three out of four teachers reported that they changed their LLS choices such as "use dictionary less" (two teachers), "more independent" (two teachers), and "more active in class" (two teachers) (including overlaps).

In this questionnaire, three out of four teachers reported that there was a distinction between learning styles and LLS. However, as to the change of their language styles in the intensive English language course, their answers were not clear, "much harder to effect change, detect change" (one teacher), "it is difficult question to answer" (one teacher), and no answer (one teacher).

CHAPTER 6: Discussion

6.1 The first research question

6.1.1 General characteristics of JYA students' sixty-one LLS choices

Firstly, it was found that there were some special features about JYA students' sixty-one LLS choices. The majority of them did not use nine out of the sixty-one LLS in the first questionnaire; No. 5 "semantic mapping", No. 6 "using keywords", No. 9 "using physical response or sensation", No. 33 "coining words", No. 37 "delaying speech production to focus on listening", No. 47 "using music", No. 48 "using laughter", No. 53 "using checklist", and No. 54 "writing a language learning diary". Judging from my experience as an English teacher in Japanese senior-high school and the result of the questionnaire for teachers in the JYA program, I can suggest that the following factors affected their LLS choices; 1) influence given by English teachers in Japan, 2) Japanese language itself, and 3) their level of English ability.

As to the first factor, it is possible to think that No. 5 "semantic mapping", No. 47 "using music", and No. 48 "using laughter", were not used very much because of this factor. Judging from my experience as an English teacher in Japan, most teachers do not teach the advantage of making a semantic map, but they just make students write down new words or expressions one after another, and they do not recommend them study English listening to music nor watching TV at all. Hence, if JYA students were influenced by teachers very much, it is understandable that they do not use these strategies very much.

As to the second factor, it is possible to think that No. 6 "using keywords" and No. 33 "coining words" were not used very much because of this factor. Japanese language does not belong to the Indo-European family of language as does English. This means that words, pronunciation, grammar, and characters of Japanese are very different from those of English. Hence, it is very difficult for them to link Japanese words to English ones with Japanese sounds or spelling, or make new English words from Japanese ones. Even if they can make a new English words from Japanese ones, other English speakers can not understand easily because of the difference between them (e.g. "paso-con" for personal computer, "wah-puro" for word processor).

As to the third factor, it is possible to think that No. 9 "using physical response or sensation" and No. 37 "delaying speech production to focus on listening" were not used very much because of this factor. No. 9 strategy is suited to remember easy stative or dynamic verbs or adjectives (e.g. sleep, walk, big, little etc.), however, it is very difficult to remember complicated verbs, nouns, adverbs and so forth (e.g. reconsider, philosophy, sometimes etc.). That is to say that this strategy is suited for novice learners who have to remember easy stative or dynamic verbs, or adjectives. No. 37 strategy is also suitable for novice learners. This strategy is relevant to the silent period theory and it normally occurs in L2 learners' first stage in their second language acquisition. However, all JYA students have learned English for seven years at least (see table 1.4 in Appendix B), and their average TOEFL score was 546.4167 (see table 2.1 in Appendix B). Therefore, they are not novice learners at all, and they did not use these strategies very much.

I can not suggest reasons why they did not use No. 53 "using checklist" and No. 54 "writing a language learning diary" very much.

On the other hand, it was found that the majority of JYA students always used six strategies; No. 19 "analysing expression", No. 25 "highlighting", No. 34 "using a circumlocution or synonym", No. 43 "seeking practice opportunities", No. 51 "rewarding yourself", and No. 56 "asking for clarification and verification" strategies. It is possible to say that the following factors affected the popularity of these LLS choices; 1) influence given by English teachers in Japan and 2) JYA students' characteristics.

As to the former factor, it is possible to think that No. 19 and No. 25 strategies were used often because of this factor. It is true, judging from my experience as an English teacher in Japan, many English teachers recommend students to use No. 19 strategy to memorise new words, and to use No. 25 strategy to take notes effectively. Hence, if they were influenced by their English teachers in Japan, it is reasonable that they used these strategies often.

As to the latter factor, it is possible to think that No. 43, 51, and 56 strategies were used very much because of this factor. According to the result of the background questionnaire, their average level of integrative motivation was 3.9996 (see table 2.3 in Appendix B), and that of instrumental motivation was 3.4583 (see table 2.4 in Appendix B). From this result, it is possible to say that they have a relatively high motivation to study English. Hence, it is reasonable that they used No. 43 strategy very much. Moreover, as seen from table 1.6 in Appendix B, they have a strong sense of inferiority in their English proficiency compared to native speakers. It is possible to say that this feeling caused them to use No. 51 and 56 strategies very much when they were using English.

Further, from the combination of the first and second questionnaire, a specific feature of JYA students has been discerned; they have a tendency not to use the strategies that the majority of them did not use in Japan

For example, from the result of the first questionnaire (see table 2.6 in Appendix B), the majority of them did not use nine strategies; No. 5 "semantic mapping", No. 6 "using keywords", No. 9 "using physical response or sensation", No. 33 "coining words", No. 37 "delaying speech production to focus on listening", No. 47 "using music", No. 48 "using laughter", No. 53 "using checklist", and No. 54 "writing a language learning diary". They reported in the second questionnaire that they did not use seven (No. 6, 9, 33, 37, 47, 48, and 53) out of these nine strategies even though they had learned English in the intensive English language course for eight weeks. As I mentioned above, 1) influence given by English teachers in Japan (No. 47, and 48), 2) Japanese language itself (No. 6, and 33), 3) their level of English (No. 9, and 37), and unclear reason (No. 53) could be the main reasons. The first reason seems to have a very powerful effect on students' English study in foreign country. Teacher (J), who worked in the intensive English language course, reported their change of LLS choices in the questionnaire for teachers (see Appendix D) as follows;

> ... Sometimes their own culture and education background are just too powerful and hold them back.

Further, as the result of the supplementary questionnaire shows (see tables 4.1-4.2.1 in Appendix B), it is true that many of them learned LLS from their teachers (thirteen out of twenty-four students). The second reason is the fundamental one; it seems very difficult for JYA students to use No. 6 and 33 strategies more. As to the third reason, it is quite reasonable that they, who were not novice learners at all, did not use the strategies for novice learners very much.

Therefore, these three reasons caused them to continue to use the specific strategies even though they had learned English in the intensive English language course.

Judging from the discussion above, it is possible to say, as a result, that JYA students' LLS choices were, to some extent, influenced by their English teachers in Japan, the Japanese language itself, their level of English, their level of motivation, and their thoughts about their English proficiency compared with native speakers.

Finally, as to the other LLS that were not in the questionnaire, although nine out of twenty-four students reported other LLS (eight strategies) that they used in Japan, seven out of these were almost the same as were in the questionnaire, the other one was not a strategy, but a teaching method; "reading English passages" = No. 17 "using resources for receiving and sending messages", "writing unfamiliar words several times reading them" = No. 11 "repeating", "practise the pronunciation of new words in the context" = No. 3 "placing new words in the context", "go to a movie in English", "sing English songs", and "talk with native speakers" = No. 15 "practising naturally", and "organise the unfamiliar words with semantic group" = No. 1 "grouping". This suggests that JYA students can not understand very well what each statement (strategy) in the questionnaire represents. However, it is possible to say that they do not use any LLS that are not in the questionnaire, because their responses about other LLS belong to the LLS in the questionnaire.

6.1.2 The relationship between JYA students' six factors and their fifteen major LLS choices.

Judging from the results of this study, several significant relationships can be seen between JYA students' six factors (sex, proficiency, major, integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, and personality) and their fifteen major LLS choices.

First, as to the sex and LLS choice, five out of fifteen major LLS were used more by female students than male students; two Social, one Metacognitive, one Affective, and one Cognitive strategy. This result is, of course, in agreement with Politzer's (1983) study, and further, it was found that JYA female students used a wider range of strategies compared with his study. This result also agrees with Oxford and Nyikos's (1989) and Ehrman and Oxford's (1989) studies to greater or lesser degrees.

Therefore, as to the sex difference and fifteen major LLS choice, there was not much difference between the result of the previous studies and this study. It is possible to say that Japanese students (JYA students) have similar characteristics in LLS choice to other students investigated by other researchers.

Second, as to the proficiency of English and fifteen major LLS choice, only three major LLS correlated with JYA students' proficiency at the significant or nearly significant level. This result does not agree to the review by Ellis (1994). The main reason may be due to their level of English. The average in the TOEFL test was 546.4167; maximum score was 590 and minimum score was 517, and all of them have learned English for at least seven years. It means that they have a relatively high proficiency in English and there is not so much difference in the score of the TOEFL test between them (S.D. = 22.0980 see table 2.1 in Appendix B). Hence, possibly, this homogeneous level of English made the result of correlation analysis a relatively poor one.

Third, as to the major and fifteen major LLS choice, two major LLS were related to JYA students' major at university at the significant or nearly significant level. Oxford and Nyikos's (1989) study indicated that social science, education, and humanities

students used more LLS than other groups, but did not show the difference within this group. In this study, this group was divided into a social science group, and English-related major group (nobody studied education or other subjects related to humanities as the major in this study). As a result, it was revealed that the English-related major group (Linguistics/English literature/American culture) used two major LLS more than other groups at the significant or nearly significant level. However, in this study, their major was also relatively homogeneous compared to Oxford and Nyikos's (1989) study; nobody studied engineering/science as the major. It is because JYA students were selected with some standards such as the score of the TOEFL test (above 500), essays and references from their universities. Further, from my experience as an English teacher in Japan, it seems true that most engineering/science students in Japan do not like to study English and, at the same time, their English proficiency is not so high compared with other students. As a result, it is very difficult for engineering /science students to be selected as JYA students. Therefore, it was found that there was not such a strong relationship between the major at university and fifteen major LLS choice as predicted in previous studies.

Fourth, as to the motivation and fifteen major LLS choice, it was proved that JYA students had similar characteristics to other students investigated by Oxford and Nyikos (1989); the stronger motivation they had, the greater LLS they used. In addition, the relationship between integrative and instrumental motivation in second language acquisition has been studied by Gardner and Lambert (1972) and they suggest that integrative motivation affected second language acquisition more than instrumental motivation. In this study, it was proved that integrative motivation affected learners' (JYA students') fifteen major LLS more than instrumental motivation as well.

Finally, as to the relationship between JYA students' personality and their fifteen major LLS choices, no significant relationship was shown in this study. This result does not agree with the previous study (Ehrman and Oxford 1989). It may be due to the difference of sample size and the definition of personality. For example, in this study, the sample size was only twenty-four, and the degree of sociability was used as only one factor of personality. On the other hand, in Ehrman and Oxford's (1989) study, the sample size was seventy-eight, and eight kinds of personality were used for their investigation. Hence, it is very difficult to obtain a comprehensive result from this study compared with their study (1989). As far as I investigated, the degree of sociability did not affect learners' (JYA students') fifteen major LLS choice significantly.

6.2 The second research question

In this study, it was found that JYA students changed their LLS choices in nine out of fifteen major LLS in the intensive English language course; two Cognitive, two Compensation, two Metacognitive, one Affective, and two Social strategies. Compared with the result of Watanabe's (1990) study, it was revealed that the experience of studying and staying abroad affected them in a wider range of strategies. Although he (1990) asked Japanese university/college students, who were studying in Japan at the time, to answer about the experience of studying and staying abroad, these factors were past events for them, and as a result, it was not clear that all of them remembered exactly what they experienced or how this experience affected their LLS. On the other hand, this study could show more clearly the influence of the experience of studying and staying abroad, because JYA students were asked about them when they were

studying or staying abroad. Further, the result in the second questionnaire supported the belief that the main factors affecting their LLS choices were the living and studying environment, and the difference in teaching method between Japan and the intensive English language course. Hence, this study shows that the experience of studying and staying abroad influences learners (JYA students) more than in his (1990) study.

In addition, as to the relationship between sex difference and the change of frequency in the use of fifteen major LLS, opposite results were found compared with the result of the relationship between sex difference and the frequency in use of LLS in Japan. In other words, male students increased the frequency in use of fifteen major LLS more than female students. It is possible to interpret this result as follows. The average frequency in the use of fifteen major LLS by male students was lower than that of female students even though it's difference was not at the .05 level of significance; male students = 2.9300, female students = 3.1236, Significance = .1471 (see table 3.16 in Appendix B). Hence, it is possible to think that this made male students increase the frequency in use of LLS a little bit easier than female students.

However, no other strong significant relationship between JYA students' factors and their fifteen major LLS choices was found. It means that the experience of studying and staying abroad can affect learners (JYA students) regardless of the other five factors considered in this study (proficiency, major, integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, and personality).

6.3 For further study

From this study, five issues that needed further study have been raised.

First, in this study, the relationship between learners' proficiency and their fifteen major LLS choices were not very significant, because their level of English was rather homogeneous. The sample used in this study was not the ideal one to investigate such a relationship. In addition, as to the relationship between learners' major and their fifteen major LLS choices, their variation of major was rather homogeneous as well because of their criterion for selection as JYA students. For further study, it is necessary that students should be varied with their proficiency of English and major, to find significant relationships between them.

Second, in this study, there was no significant relationship between learners' personality and their fifteen major LLS choices. This is maybe because only one factor of personality (the degree of sociability) was employed in this study. Although this factor was employed so that students could understand the questionnaire easily, in reality, it seems to me that only one factor was not enough to find the relationship between them. Judging from Ehrman and Oxford's (1989) study, the measure of MBTI seemed to be useful to divide students' personality even though it lacked clear definition and justification about the categorisation of personality. Hence, for further study, it is necessary to use the measure of MBTI with clear definition and justification, or some other measures to divide students' personality.

Third, in this study, it was found that the experience of studying and staying abroad affected students' LLS choices regardless of students' six factors (sex, proficiency, major, integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, and personality). However, this result is not supported by other researchers yet. It means that this result is open to argument. For further study, it is necessary that this result should be examined or argued by other researchers.

Fourth, as I mentioned above, in this study, the sample size was not big enough to carry out the quantitative research. It seems to me that this is one of the main reasons why this study sometimes failed to show the significant relationship between learners' factors and their LLS choices. On the other hand however, it is true that students who attended the same class or participated in the same program were preferable in order to find the relationship between teaching method and students' LLS choices. Therefore, only twenty-four students who participated in JYA program could be the subjects of this study. For further study, it is necessary for researchers to collect more data, or change the research method into qualitative research or use both quantitative and qualitative research.

As a final issue, this LLS study is not a study for itself, but it should be applied to second or foreign language learning. Several researchers of course, have already studied the relationship between LLS and second or foreign language learning. For example, Bialystok (1983b) investigated the relationship between strategy training and vocabulary acquisition, but failed to find a clear relationship between them. Cohen and Aphek (1980) carried out their study about the relationship between learners' use of association strategies and vocabulary learning and they found that association strategies helped advanced learners to learn vocabulary. O'Malley et al. (1985b) studied whether strategy training could improve learners' speaking and listening skills and found clear improvement of speaking skill through strategy training, but failed to find any significant improvement of listening skill. However, it is still not clear how teachers should teach or train students to use LLS for their successful language learning. Although this study indicated the possibility that the teaching method could affect students' LLS use, this study could not find this relationship in detail. For further study, it is necessary to investigate this area as well.

CHAPTER 7: Conclusion

In this study, I investigated the relationship between six factors of Japanese students (sex, proficiency, major, integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, and personality) and their LLS choices, and which factor could affect their LLS choices most. I also investigated whether their experience of studying and staying abroad could affect their LLS choices.

Twenty-four Japanese students, who all belonged to the JYA program and took he intensive English language course, participated in this study and they were asked to complete the questionnaire twice; in the first week and in the eighth week out of ten of their course. Teachers who worked in the program were also asked to complete the questionnaire in the eighth week about their teaching methods and comment on students' LLS.

As a result of this study, it was found that their sex, integrative motivation, and instrumental motivation affected their LLS choices significantly, and the relationship between their major at university and their LLS was significant in limited strategies. However, the relationship between their proficiency of English and personality, and their LLS choices was not so significant. As to the relationship between their experience of studying and staying abroad, and their LLS choices, it was found that both experience of studying and staying abroad could affect their LLS choice significantly, especially for male students. However, it was not found in this study that learners' other factors (proficiency, major, integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, and personality) could affect their LLS choices whilst studying with the intensive English language course and staying abroad.

NOTES

1

Metacognitive strategies (9) - advance organizers, directed attention, selective attention, self-management, advance preparation, self-monitoring, delayed production, self-evaluation, self-reinforcement.
Cognitive strategies (16) - repetition, resourcing, directed physical response, translation, grouping, note-taking, deduction, recombination, imagery, auditory representation, keyword, contextualization, elaboration, transfer, inferencing, question for clarification.
Social/affective strategies (1) - cooperation.

2

(1) Direct strategies
1. Memory strategies
A. Creating mental linkages - 1) grouping, 2) association/elaborating, 3) placing new words into a context.
B. Applying images and sounds - 4) using imagery 5) semantic mapping, 6) using keywords 7) representing sounds in memory.
C. Reviewing well - 8) structured reviewing
D. Employing action - 9) using physical response or sensation, 10) using mechanical techniques
2. Cognitive strategies
A. Practicing - 11) repeating, 12) formally practicing with sounds and writing systems 13) recognizing and using formulas and patterns, 14) recombining 15) practicing naturally.
B. Receiving and sending messages - 16) getting the idea quickly, 17) using resources for receiving and sending messages.
C. Analyzing and reasoning - 18) reasoning deductively, 19) analyzing expressions 20) analyzing contrastively (across languages) 21) translating, 22) transferring
D. Creating structure for input and output - 23) taking notes, 24) summarizing, 25) highlighting.
3. Compensation strategies.
A. Guessing intelligently - 26) using linguistic clues, 27) using other clues
B. Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing.
28) switching to the mother tongue, 29) getting help, 30) using mime or gesture 31) avoiding communication partially or totally, 32) selecting the topic 33) adjusting or approximating the message, 34) coining words, 35) using a circumlocution or synonym.
(2) Indirect strategies
1. Metacognitive strategies.
A. Centering your learning - 36) overviewing and linking with already known material 37) paying attention, 38)

delaying speech production to focus on listening.

B. Arranging and planning your learning - 39) finding out about language learning 40) organizing, 41) setting goals and objectives 42) identifying the purpose of a language task 43) planning for a language task, 44) seeking practice opportunities.

C. Evaluating your learning - 45) self-monitoring, 46) self-evaluating.

2. Affective strategies.

A. Lowering your anxiety - 47) using progressive relaxation, deep breathing, or meditation, 48) using music, 49) using laughter

B. Encouraging yourself - 50) making positive statements, 51) taking risks wisely 52) rewarding yourself

C. Taking your emotional temperature - 53) listening to your body, 54) using checklists 55) writing a language learning diary 56) discussing your feelings with someone else.

3. Social strategies.

A. Asking questions - 57) asking for clarification or verification, 58) asking for correction

B. Cooperating with others - 59) Cooperating with peers, 60) Cooperating with proficient uses of the new language.

C. Empathizing with others - 61) developing cultural understanding 62) becoming aware of others' thoughts and feelings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, J.R. (1983). The architecture of cognition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bejarano, Y. (1987). A cooperative small-group methodology in the language classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 21 (3), 483-504.

Bialystok, E. (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. Language Learning, 28, 69-83.

Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. Modern Language Journal, 65, 24-35.

Bialystok, E. (1983a). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper (Eds.), Strategies in interlanguage communication (pp. 100-118). London: Longman.

Bialystok, E. (1983b). Inferencing: Testing the "hypothesis-testing" hypothesis. In H.W. Seliger and M.H. Long (Eds.), Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition (pp. 104-124). Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury house.

Bialystok, E., and Frohlich, M. (1978). Variables of classroom achievement in second language learning. Modern Language Journal, 30, 255-270.

Byman, A., and Cramer, D. (1990). Quantitative data analysis for social scientists. London: Routledge.

Chamot, A. (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students'. In A. Wenden and J. Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategy in language learning (pp. 71-83). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Chesterfield, R., and Chesterfield, K. (1985). Natural order in children's use of 2nd language-learning strategies. Applied Linguistics, 6 (1), 45-59.

Cohen, A., and Aphek, E. (1980). Retention of second-language, vocabulary over time: investigating the role of mnemonic associations. System, 8, 221-235.

Cohen, A., and Aphek, E. (1981). Easifying second language learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 3,221-236.

Cramer, D. (1994). Introducing statistics for social research. London: Routledge.

Ehrman, M. (1990). The role of personality type in adult language learning: an ongoing investigation. In T. Parry and C. Stanfield (Eds.), Language aptitude reconsidered (pp. 126-178). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Ehrman, M., and Oxford, R. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. Modern English Journal, 73, 291-300.

Ellis, R. (1994). The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Faerch, C., and Kasper, G. (Eds.) (1983). Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman.

Fillmore, L.W. (1979). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In C.D.Fillmore, P.Kempler, and W. Wang (Eds.), Individual differences in language ability and language behavior (pp. 203-228). New York: Academic Press.

Fillmore, C., Kempler, D., and Wang, W. (Eds.) (1979). Individual differences in learning ability and language behavior. New York, Academic Press.

Gardner, R.C., and Lambert, W.E. (1972). Attitude and motivation in second language learning. Massachusetts: Newburry House.

Gardner, R.C., Smythe, P.C., and Brunet, G.R. (1977). Intensive second learning study: Effects on attitude, motivation and French achievement. Language Learning, 27 (2) 243-261.

Hamayan, Else, V., and Richard, Tucker, G. (1979). Strategies of communication used by native and non-native speakers of French. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 17, 83-96.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H., and Todesco, A. (1978). The Good Language Learner. Research in Education Series, 7. Tronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

O'Malley, J., and Chamot, A. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., Stewner-Manzanaraes, G., Kupper, L., and Russo, R. (1985a). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. Language Learning, 35 (1), 21-46.

O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., Stewner-Manzanaraes, G., Russo, R., and Kupper, L. (1985b). Learning strategy applications with students of English as second language. TESOL Quarterly, 19 (3), 557-584.

Opper, S., Teichler, U., and Carlson, J. (1990). Impacts of study abroad programmes on students and graduates. Higher Education Policy Series 11, vol. 11. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Oxford, R. (1989). Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. System, 17 (2), 235-247.

Oxford, R. (1990). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. London: Newburry House.

Oxford, R. (1993). Research on second language learning strategies. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13, 175-187.

Oxford, R., and Nyikos, M., and Ehrman, M. (1988). Vive la difference?: Reflections on sex differences in issue of language learning strategies. Foreign Language Annals, 21 (4), 321-329.

Oxford, R., and Crookall, S. (1989). Research on language learning strategies-methods, findings, and technical and instructional issues. Modern Language Journal, 73, 404-419

Oxford, R., and Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. Modern Language Journal, 73, 291-300.

Oxford, R., and Anderson, N.J. (1995). A crosscultural view of learning styles. Language Teaching, 28 (4), 201-215.

Parry, S., and Stanfield, C. (1990). Language aptitude reconsidered. Englewood, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Politzer, R. (1983). An exploratory study of self reported language learning behaviors and their relation to achievement. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6, 54-67.

Politzer, R., and McGroarty, M. (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviors and their relationship to gain in linguistic and communicate competence. TESOL Quarterly, 19 (1), 103-123.

Reid, J.M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. TESOL Quarterly, 21 (1), 87-111.

Rubin, J. (1981). Study of cognitive process in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 2, 117-131.

Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In A. Wenden and J. Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategies in language learning (pp. 15-30). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Seliger, H.W., and Long, M.H. (1983). Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition. Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury house.

Skehan, P. (1989). Individual difference in Second-Language Learning. London: Edward Arnold.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. Language Learning, 30 (2), 417-431.

Watanabe, Y. (1990). External variables affecting language learning strategies of Japanese EFL learners: Effects of entrance examination, years spent at college/university and staying overseas. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation: Lancaster University.

Wenden, A. (1986). What do second-language learners know about their language learning?: A second look at retrospective accounts. Applied Linguistics, 7 (2), 186-205.

Wenden, A. (1987). How to be a successful language learner: Insights and prescriptions from L2 learners. In A. Wenden and J. Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategies in language learning (pp. 103-115). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Wenden, A., and Rubin, J. (Eds.) (1987). Learner strategies in language learning. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A: The list of language learning strategies (LLS) (based on Oxford's (1990) list)

	No.	5 categories of LLS	No.	15 major LLS	No.	61 LLS
Direct strategies	1	Cognitive	1	Practising	1	grouping
					2	association/elaborating
					3	placing new words into a context
					4	using imagery
					5	semantic mapping
					6	using keywords
					7	representing sounds in memory
					8	structured reviewing
					9	using physical response or sensation
					10	using mechanical technique
					11	repeating
					12	formally practising with sounds and writing systems
					13	recognising and using formulas and patterns
					14	recombining
					15	practising naturally
			2	Receiving and sending messages	16	getting the idea quickly
					17	using resources for receiving and sending messages
			3	Analysing and reasoning	18	reasoning deductively
					19	analysing expressions
					20	analysing contrastively
					21	translating
					22	transferring
			4	Creating structure for	23	taking notes

				input and output		
					24	summarising
					25	highlighting
	2	Compensation	5	Guessing intelligently	26	using linguistic clues
					27	using other clues
			6	Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing	28	switching to the mother tongue
					29	getting help
					30	using mime or gesture
					31	avoiding communication partially or totally
					32	selecting the topic
					33	coining words
					34	using a circumlocution or synonym
Indirect strategies	3	Metacognitive	7	Centring your learning	35	overviewing and linking with already known material
					36	paying attention
					37	delaying speech production to focus on listening
			8	Arranging and planning your learning	38	finding out about language learning
					39	organising
					40	setting goals and objectives
					41	identifying the purpose of a language task
					42	planning for a language task
					43	seeking practice opportunities
			9	Evaluating your learning	44	self-monitoring
					45	self-evaluating

	4	Affective	10	Lowering your anxiety	46	using progressive relaxation, deep breathing, or meditation
					47	using music
					48	using laughter
			11	Encouraging yourself	49	making positive statements
					50	taking risks wisely
					51	rewarding yourself
			12	Taking your emotional temperature	52	listening to your body
					53	using checklist
					54	writing a language learning diary
					55	discussing your feeling with someone else
	5	Social	13	Asking questions	56	asking for clarification or verification
					57	asking for correction
			14	Co-operating with others	58	co-operating with peers
					59	co-operating with proficient uses of the new language
			15	Empathising with others	60	developing cultural understanding
					61	becoming aware of others' thoughts and feeling

Appendix B: The result of questionnaires.

Table.1 The description of frequency of background questionnaire.
Table.1.1 The number of subject in JYA program.

SEX	NUMBER
MALE	10
FEMALE	14
TOTAL	24

Table.1.2 Age

AGE	20	21	22	23	24	TOTAL
NUMBER	7	10	5	1	1	24

Table 1.3 Nationality

	JAPANESE	SOUTH KOREAN	TOTAL
NUMBER	23	1	24

Table 1.4 The duration of studying English

	YEARS OF STUDY					
YEARS	7	8	9	10	11~	TOTAL
NUMBER	2	11	3	5	3	24

Table 1.5 Self reporting about the proficiency in English as compared with other Japanese people.

	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT	NO ANSWER	TOTAL
NUMBER	1	6	15	1	1	24

Table 1.6 Self reporting about the proficiency in English as compared with native speakers of English.

	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT	NO ANSWER	TOTAL
NUMBER	17	4	2	0	1	24

Table 1.7 The degree of importance of being proficient in English.

	NOT SO IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	TOTAL
NUMBER	0	10	14	24

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1.8 Enjoy learning language or not.

	YES	NO	NO ANSWER	TOTAL
NUMBER	21	2	1	24

Table 1.9 Other languages that students have learned.(including overlaps)

	FRENCH	SPANISH	CHINESE	GERMAN	KOREAN	GREEK	RUSSIAN	LATIN	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	11	6	5	5	2	1	1	1	1	32

Table 2 The description of frequency of the first questionnaire.

Table.2.1 JYA students' English Proficiency (TOEFL score)

SCORE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
590~599	0	1	1
580~589	10	0	1
570~579	1	1	2
560~569	4	1	5
550~559	1	3	4
540~549	0	2	2
530~539	1	1	2
520~529	1	3	4
510~519	1	2	3
TOTAL	10	14	24
MEAN	551.6000	542.7143	546.4167
S.D.	21.4785	22.5676	22.0980

Table 2.2 JYA students' Major at university

		SEX		
	MAJOR	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
1	Management	0	2	2
	Economics	2	1	3
2	Law	1	0	1
	Sociology	1	1	2
	Politics	3	0	3
	International relation.	2	2	4
3	Linguistics	0	4	4
	English literature	1	3	4
	American culture	0	1	1
TOTAL		10	14	24

Table 2.3 JYA students' level of the Integrative Motivation

	SEX		
SCALE of integrative motivation	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
4.50~5.00	1	3	4
4.00~4.49	5	8	13
3.50~3.99	2	1	3
3.00~3.49	2	1	3
2.50~2.99	0	1	1
2.00~2.49	0	0	0
1.50~1.99	0	0	0
1.00~1.49	0	0	0
TOTAL	10	14	24
MEAN	3.9000	4.0707	3.9996
S.D.	.4181	.5899	.5213

Table 2.4 JYA students' level of the Instrumental Motivation

	SEX		
SCALE of instrumental motivation	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
4.50~5.00	1	2	3
4.00~4.49	2	3	5
3.50~3.99	0	3	3
3.00~3.49	6	1	7
2.50~2.99	1	3	4
2.00~2.49	0	1	1
1.50~1.99	0	0	0
1.00~1.49	0	1	1
TOTAL	10	14	24
MEAN	3.5650	3.3821	3.4583
S.D.	.5895	1.1079	.9155

Table 2.5 JYA students' level of the Sociability

	SEX		
SCALE OF SOCIABILITY	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
5	0	3	3
4	6	6	12
3	2	2	4
2	2	3	5
1	0	0	0
TOTAL	10	14	24
MEAN	3.4000	3.6429	3.5417
S.D.	.8433	1.0818	.9771

Table 2.6 Result of JYA students' responses to the frequency about their LLS choices in the first and second questionnaire.

Frequency No.1 = I never or almost never do it.
No.2 = I occasionally do it.
No.3 = I sometimes do it.
No.4 = I often do it.
No.5 = I always or almost always do it.

		The first questionnaire					The second questionnaire				
Statement No.	N of frequency	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1	N of student	1	11	5	5	2	3	7	5	8	1
	%	4.2	45.8	20.8	20.8	8.3	12.5	29.2	20.8	33.3	4.2
2	N of student	1	3	4	10	6	2	4	5	10	3
	%	4.2	12.5	16.7	41.7	25.0	8.3	16.7	20.8	41.7	12.5
3	N of student	6	6	8	4	0	3	5	8	6	2
	%	25.0	25.0	33.3	16.7	0.0	12.5	20.8	33.3	25.0	8.3
4	N of student	4	7	1	8	4	8	5	6	5	0
	%	16.7	29.2	4.2	33.3	16.7	33.3	20.8	25.0	20.8	0.0
5	N of student	13	7	3	0	1	10	8	3	2	1
	%	54.2	29.2	12.5	0.0	4.2	41.7	33.3	12.5	8.3	4.2
6	N of student	15	3	4	1	1	17	6	1	0	0
	%	62.5	12.5	16.7	4.2	4.2	70.8	25.0	4.2	0.0	0.0
7	N of student	2	7	6	8	1	7	6	5	5	1
	%	8.3	29.2	25.0	33.3	4.2	29.2	25.0	20.8	20.8	4.2
8	N of student	3	6	10	4	1	3	6	6	7	2
	%	12.5	25.0	41.7	16.7	4.2	12.5	25.0	25.0	29.2	8.3
9	N of student	14	8	1	1	0	14	5	4	1	0
	%	58.3	33.3	4.2	4.2	0.0	58.3	20.8	16.7	4.2	0.0
10	N of student	4	7	7	6	0	13	3	4	4	0
	%	16.7	29.2	29.2	25.0	0.0	54.2	12.5	16.7	16.7	0.0
11	N of student	0	3	3	11	7	4	11	3	6	0
	%	0.0	12.5	12.5	45.8	29.2	16.7	45.8	12.5	25.0	0.0
12	N of student	6	1	6	6	5	8	3	5	5	3
	%	25.0	4.2	25.0	25.0	20.8	33.3	12.5	20.8	20.8	12.5
13	N of student	0	3	11	9	1	3	3	9	8	1
	%	0.0	12.5	45.8	37.5	4.2	12.5	12.5	37.5	33.3	4.2
14	N of student	1	7	9	5	2	4	4	8	6	2
	%	4.2	29.2	37.5	20.8	8.3	16.7	16.7	33.3	25.0	8.3
15	N of student	2	4	4	10	4	0	0	2	6	16

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	%	8.3	16.7	16.7	41.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	8.3	25.0	66.7
16	N.of student	1	2	5	9	7	0	0	6	8	10
	%	4.2	8.3	20.8	37.5	29.2	0.0	0.0	25.0	33.3	41.7
17	N.of student	2	8	7	7	0	2	2	7	8	5
	%	8.3	33.3	29.2	29.2	0.0	8.3	8.3	29.2	33.3	20.8
18	N.of student	3	8	4	6	3	3	4	5	11	1
	%	12.5	33.3	16.7	25.0	12.5	12.5	16.7	20.8	45.8	4.2
19	N.of student	0	2	1	9	12	2	2	7	9	4
	%	0.0	8.3	4.2	37.5	50.0	8.3	8.3	29.2	37.5	16.7
20	N.of student	4	9	5	3	3	5	13	2	2	2
	%	16.7	37.5	20.8	12.5	12.5	20.8	54.2	8.3	8.3	8.3
21	N.of student	0	2	6	8	8	2	0	2	6	14
	%	0.0	8.3	25.0	33.3	33.3	8.3	0.0	8.3	25.0	58.3
22	N.of student	9	6	5	3	1	10	7	4	1	2
	%	37.5	25.0	20.8	12.5	4.2	41.7	29.2	16.7	4.2	8.3
23	N.of student	3	1	2	12	6	0	0	2	11	11
	%	12.5	4.2	8.3	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	45.8	45.8
24	N.of student	4	9	8	3	0	8	6	6	3	1
	%	16.7	37.5	33.3	12.5	0.0	33.3	25.0	25.0	12.5	4.2
25	N.of student	0	0	4	6	14	0	0	3	6	15
	%	0.0	0.0	16.7	25.0	58.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	62.5
26	N.of student	0	3	5	9	7	1	2	1	9	11
	%	0.0	12.5	20.8	37.5	29.2	4.2	8.3	4.2	37.5	45.8
27	N.of student	1	6	2	9	6	0	3	2	11	8
	%	4.2	25.0	8.3	37.5	25.0	0.0	12.5	8.3	45.8	33.3
28	N.of student	4	8	5	6	1	1	7	11	4	1
	%	16.7	33.3	20.8	25.0	4.2	4.2	29.2	45.8	16.7	4.2
29	N.of student	0	2	6	10	6	0	3	6	11	4
	%	0.0	8.3	25.0	41.7	25.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	45.8	16.7
30	N.of student	1	3	4	11	5	0	2	3	9	10
	%	4.2	12.5	16.7	45.8	20.8	0.0	8.3	12.5	37.5	41.7
31	N.of student	4	10	5	5	0	3	11	7	3	0
	%	16.7	41.7	20.8	20.8	0.0	12.5	45.8	29.2	12.5	0.0
32	N.of student	0	1	5	15	3	0	1	6	7	10
	%	0.0	4.2	20.8	62.5	12.5	0.0	4.2	25.0	29.2	41.7
33	N.of student	14	7	3	0	0	14	4	3	3	0
	%	58.3	29.2	12.5	0.0	0.0	58.3	16.7	12.5	12.5	0.0
34	N.of student	0	1	2	6	15	0	0	1	5	18
	%	0.0	4.2	8.3	25.0	62.5	0.0	0.0	4.2	20.8	75.0
35	N.of student	3	2	5	6	8	1	5	8	6	4

	%	12.5	8.3	20.8	25.0	33.3	4.2	20.8	33.3	25.0	16.7
36	N.of student	1	2	5	11	5	1	0	0	10	13
	%	4.2	8.3	20.8	45.8	20.8	4.2	0.0	0.0	41.7	54.2
37	N.of student	19	3	2	0	0	19	4	1	0	0
	%	79.2	12.5	8.3	0.0	0.0	79.2	16.7	4.2	0.0	0.0
38	N.of student	1	4	5	9	5	0	1	5	14	4
	%	4.2	16.7	20.8	37.5	20.8	0.0	4.2	20.8	58.3	16.7
39	N.of student	3	10	6	3	2	2	6	5	8	3
	%	12.5	41.7	25.0	12.5	8.3	8.3	25.0	20.8	33.3	12.5
40	N.of student	1	5	3	7	8	0	1	6	10	7
	%	4.2	20.8	12.5	29.2	33.3	0.0	4.2	25.0	41.7	29.2
41	N.of student	2	3	9	5	5	0	2	6	8	8
	%	8.3	12.5	37.5	20.8	20.8	0.0	8.3	25.0	33.3	33.3
42	N.of student	1	8	7	5	3	2	6	6	8	2
	%	4.2	33.3	29.2	20.8	12.5	8.3	25.0	25.0	33.3	8.3
43	N.of student	0	0	1	9	14	0	1	3	4	16
	%	0.0	0.0	4.2	37.5	58.3	0.0	4.2	12.5	16.7	66.7
44	N.of student	0	0	8	5	11	0	0	1	7	16
	%	0.0	0.0	33.3	20.8	45.8	0.0	0.0	4.2	29.2	66.7
45	N.of student	2	2	4	7	9	0	0	1	9	14
	%	8.3	8.3	16.7	29.2	37.5	0.0	0.0	4.2	37.5	58.3
46	N.of student	1	4	3	8	8	1	2	7	4	10
	%	4.2	16.7	12.5	33.3	33.3	4.2	8.3	29.2	16.7	41.7
47	N.of student	13	5	3	3	0	15	4	2	2	1
	%	54.2	20.8	12.5	12.5	0.0	62.5	16.7	8.3	8.3	4.2
48	N.of student	17	5	2	0	0	22	1	1	0	0
	%	70.8	20.8	8.3	0.0	0.0	91.7	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.0
49	N.of student	9	5	2	6	2	10	2	5	3	4
	%	37.5	20.8	8.3	25.0	8.3	41.7	8.3	20.8	12.5	16.7
50	N.of student	5	6	7	5	1	4	4	8	6	2
	%	20.8	25.0	29.2	20.8	4.2	16.7	16.7	33.3	25.0	8.3
51	N.of student	3	4	1	4	12	3	3	4	9	5
	%	12.5	16.7	4.2	16.7	50.0	12.5	12.5	16.7	37.5	20.8
52	N.of student	5	6	7	4	2	4	7	6	4	3
	%	20.8	25.0	29.2	16.7	8.3	16.7	29.2	25.0	16.7	12.5
53	N.of student	17	6	0	1	0	22	2	0	0	0
	%	70.8	25.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
54	N.of student	14	6	4	3	0	11	3	3	3	4
	%	58.3	25.0	4.2	12.5	0.0	45.8	12.5	12.5	12.5	16.7
55	N.of student	6	5	9	3	1	2	5	7	3	7

	%	25.0	20.8	37.5	12.5	4.2	8.3	20.8	29.2	12.5	29.2
56	N.of student	1	0	2	8	13	0	3	8	7	6
	%	4.2	0.0	8.3	33.3	54.2	0.0	12.5	33.3	29.2	25.0
57	N.of student	7	2	9	5	1	4	7	8	5	0
	%	29.2	8.3	37.5	20.8	4.2	16.7	29.2	33.3	20.8	0.0
58	N.of student	5	8	6	4	1	1	3	8	6	6
	%	20.8	33.3	25.0	16.7	4.2	4.2	12.5	33.3	25.0	25.0
59	N.of student	0	5	7	11	1	0	4	3	11	6
	%	0.0	20.8	29.2	45.8	4.2	0.0	16.7	12.5	45.8	25.0
60	N.of student	0	2	9	8	5	0	4	5	10	5
	%	0.0	8.3	37.5	33.3	20.8	0.0	16.7	20.8	41.7	20.8
61	N.of student	1	7	9	6	1	0	2	13	8	1
	%	4.2	29.2	37.5	25.0	4.2	0.0	8.3	54.2	33.3	4.2

Table.3 The relationship between Affective factors & the frequency of LLS choice

ANOVA analysis: The relationship between learners' Sex and their 15 major LLS choices

Table 3.1
Independent variable : Factor 1. Sex
Dependent variable: LLS:1 = Practising strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	2.8080	.3953	1.4066	10
FEMALE	2.8100	.3735	1.8138	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.8092	.3826	3.2204	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0000	1	.0000
WITHIN GROUPS	3.2204	22	.1464

F value = .0002 Significance = .9900

Table 3.2
Independent variable : Factor 1. Sex
Dependent variable: LLS:2 = Reviewing and sending messages strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	2.9500	.7976	5.7250	10
FEMALE	3.3537	.6640	5.7321	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.2917	.7127	11.4751	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.6857	1	.6857
WITHIN GROUPS	12.8343	22	.5834

F value = 3.8427 Significance = .0627

Table 3.3
Independent variable : Factor 1. Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:3 = Analysing and reasoning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	3.4000	.9888	8.8000	10
FEMALE	3.0571	.5771	4.0343	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.2000	.7368	12.8343	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.6857	1	.6857
WITHIN GROUPS	12.8343	22	.5834

F value = 1.1754 Significance = .2900

Table 3.4
Independent variable : Factor1. Sex
Dependent variable: LLS:4 = Creating structure for input and output strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	3.0320	.8232	6.0988	10
FEMALE	3.8557	.3394	1.4975	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.5125	.5876	7.5963	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	3.9579	1	3.9579
WITHIN GROUPS	7.5963	22	.3453

F value = 11.4628 Significance = .0027

Table 3.5
Independent variable : Factor1. Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:5 = Guessing intelligently strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	3.7500	.9204	7.6250	10
FEMALE	3.6429	.9493	11.7143	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.6875	.9376	19.3393	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0670	1	.0670
WITHIN GROUPS	19.3393	22	.8791

F value = .0762 Significance = .7851

Table 3.6
Independent variable : Factor1. Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:6 = Overcoming limitation in speaking and writing strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	3.1430	.3646	1.1964	10
FEMALE	3.2557	.3076	1.2303	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.2087	.3321	2.4268	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0741	1	.0741
WITHIN GROUPS	2.4268	22	.1103

F value = .6718 Significance = .4212

Table 3.7
Independent variable : Factor1. Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:7 = Centring your learning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	2.9670	.8386	6.3292	10
FEMALE	2.8671	.7953	8.2221	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.90880	.8133	14.5513	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0582	1	.0582
WITHIN GROUPS	14.5513	22	.6614

F value = .0879 Significance = .7696

Table 3.8
Independent variable : Factor1. Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:8 = Arranging and planning your learning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S	CASES
MALE	3.2510	.7010	4.4223	10
FEMALE	3.6064	.7019	6.4049	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.4587	.7015	10.8272	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.7369	1	.7369
WITHIN GROUPS	10.8272	22	.4921

F value = 1.4974 Significance = .2340

Table 3.9
Independent variable : Factor1. Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:9 = Evaluating your learning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	4.0000	.6667	4.0000	10
FEMALE	4.0714	.6462	5.4286	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	4.0417	.6547	9.4286	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0298	1	.0298
WITHIN GROUPS	9.4286	22	.4286

F value = .0694 Significance = .7946

Table 3.10
Independent variable : Factor1. Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:10 = Lowering your anxiety strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	2.1330	.7398	4.9254	10
FEMALE	2.4514	.6225	5.0382	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.3187	.6730	9.9636	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.5915	1	.5915
WITHIN GROUPS	9.9636	22	.4529

F value = 1.3060 Significance = .2654

Table 3.11
Independent variable : Factor1. Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:11 = Encouraging yourself strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	2.7000	1.0580	10.0734	10
FEMALE	3.1200	1.0102	13.2674	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.9450	1.0300	23.3408	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	1.0290	1	1.0290
WITHIN GROUPS	23.3408	22	1.0609

F value = 0.9699 Significance = .3354

Table 3.12
Independent variable : Factor1. Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:12 = Taking your emotional temperature strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	1.7000	.7619	5.2250	10
FEMALE	2.2679	.4098	2.1830	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.0313	.5803	7.4080	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	1.8810	1	1.8810
WITHIN GROUPS	7.4080	22	.3367

F value = 5.5862 Significance = .0274

Table 3.13
Independent variable : Factor1 Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:13 = Asking questions strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	3.1000	1.0220	9.4000	10
FEMALE	3.7500	.6124	4.8750	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.4792	.8055	14.2750	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2.4646	1	2.4646
WITHIN GROUPS	14.2750	22	.6489

F value = 3.7983 Significance = .0642

Table 3.14
Independent variable : Factor1 Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:14 = Co-operating with others strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	2.5000	.9129	7.5000	10
FEMALE	3.2143	.8254	8.8571	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.9167	.8623	16.3571	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2.9762	1	2.9762
WITHIN GROUPS	16.3571	22	.7435

F value = 4.0029 Significance = .0579

Table 3.15
Independent variable : Factor1 Sex
Dependent variable : LLS:15 = Empathising with others strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	3.0500	.7976	5.7250	10
FEMALE	3.4286	.8957	10.4286	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.2708	.8569	16.1536	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.8360	1	.8360
WITHIN GROUPS	16.1536	22	.7343

F value = 1.1386 Significance = .2975

Table 3.16
Independent variable : Factor 1: Sex
Dependent variable : the average of frequency of fifteen major strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	2.9300	.3431	1.0596	10
FEMALE	3.1236	.2868	1.0693	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.0429	.3111	2.1289	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.2186	1	.2186
WITHIN GROUPS	2.1289	22	.0968

F value = 2.2587 Significance = .1471

CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYSIS

Table 3.17
Correlation coefficient between learners' Proficiency and their 15 major LLS choices

	PRACTISING	REVIEWING AND SENDING MESSAGES	ANALYSING AND REASONING	CREATING STRUCTURE FOR INPUT AND OUTPUT	GUESSING INTELLIGENTLY
COEFFICIENT	.0628	.3976	-.1955	.0383	.2819
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.771	P=.054	P=.360	P=.859	P=.182

	OVERCOMING LIMITATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING	CENTRING YOUR LEARNING	ARRANGING AND PLANNING YOUR LEARNING	EVALUATING YOUR LEARNING	LOWERING YOUR ANXIETY
COEFFICIENT	-.2975	-.1791	.0875	.0509	-.0171
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.186	P=.402	P=.684	P=.813	P=.937

	ENCOURAGING YOURSELF	TAKING YOUR EMOTIONAL TEMPERATURE	ASKING QUESTION	CO-OPERATING WITH OTHERS	EMPATHISING WITH OTHERS
COEFFICIENT	-.1179	-.4011	.1423	.0039	.4471
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.583	P=.052	P=.507	P=.985	P=.029

	THE AVERAGE OF FREQUENCY OF FIFTEEN MAJOR STRATEGIES
COEFFICIENT	.0168
CASES	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P = .938

ANOVA analysis: The relationship between learners' Major and their 15 major LLS choices

Major 1 = Management, Economics
2 = Law, Sociology, Politics, International relations
3 = Linguistics, English literature, American culture

Table 3.18
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:1 = Practising strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	2.8260	.4699	.8833	5
2	2.7680	.3564	1.1432	10
3	2.8456	.3814	1.1636	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.8092	.3898	3.1901	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0303	2	.0151
WITHIN GROUPS	3.1901	21	.1519

F value = 0.997 Significance = .9056

Table 3.19
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:2 = Reviewing and sending messages strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	3.4000	.4183	.7000	5
2	3.2000	.9487	8.1000	10
3	3.3333	.7500	4.5000	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.2917	.7958	13.3000	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.1583	2	.0792
WITHIN GROUPS	13.3000	21	.6333

F value = .1250 Significance = .8831

Table 3.20
Independent variable: Facor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:3 = Analysing and reasoning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	2.6000	.6164	1.5200	5
2	3.4200	.9307	7.7960	10
3	3.2889	.4807	1.8489	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.2000	.7292	11.1649	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2.3551	2	1.1776
WITHIN GROUPS	11.1649	21	.5317

F value = 2.2149 Significance = .1340

Table 3.21
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:4 = Creating structure for input and output strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	3.5320	.6482	1.6805	5
2	3.2320	.9039	7.3530	10
3	3.8133	.3387	.9176	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.5125	.6884	9.9510	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	1.6032	2	.8016
WITHIN GROUPS	9.9510	21	.4739

F value = 1.6917 Significance = .2084

Table 3.22
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:5 = Guessing intelligently strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	3.4000	1.1402	5.2000	5
2	3.7500	.9789	8.6250	10
3	3.7788	.7949	5.0556	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.6875	.9482	18.8806	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.5257	2	.2628
WITHIN GROUPS	18.8806	21	.8891

F value = 2924 Significance = .7495

Table 3.23
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:6 = Overcoming limitation in speaking and writing strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	3.0000	.2686	.2886	5
2	3.1860	.3317	.9904	10
3	3.3500	.3200	.8192	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.2087	.3161	2.0982	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.4026	2	.2013
WITHIN GROUPS	2.0982	21	.0999

F value = 2.0148 Significance = .1583

Table 3.24
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:7 = Centring your learning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	2.7360	.7223	2.0871	5
2	2.8620	.7738	5.3888	10
3	3.0567	.9196	6.7656	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.9088	.8235	14.2415	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.3680	2	.1840
WITHIN GROUPS	14.2415	21	.6782

F value = .2713 Significance = .7650

Table 3.25
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:8 = Arranging and planning your learning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	3.4660	.4627	.8565	5
2	3.3010	.7662	5.2841	10
3	3.6289	.7837	4.9139	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.4583	.7225	11.0545	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.5096	2	.2548
WITHIN GROUPS	11.0545	21	.5264

F value = .4841 Significance = .6230

Table 3.26
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:9 = Evaluating your learning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	3.7000	.5701	1.3000	5
2	4.0500	.6433	3.7250	10
3	4.2222	.6667	3.5556	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	4.0417	.6392	8.5806	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.8778	2	.4389
WITHIN GROUPS	8.5806	21	.4086

F value = 1.0741 Significance = .3596

Table 3.27
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:10 = Lowering your anxiety strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	2.0680	.3656	5347	5
2	2.2320	.7206	4.6730	10
3	2.5544	.7465	4.4578	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.3188	.6784	9.6655	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.8896	2	.4448
WITHIN GROUPS	9.6555	21	.4603

F value = .9664 Significance = .3967

Table 3.28
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:11 = Encouraging yourself strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	2.1340	.9896	3.9169	5
2	2.9000	.8752	6.8934	10
3	3.4456	.9997	7.9956	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.9450	.9463	18.8059	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	5.5639	2	2.7819
WITHIN GROUPS	18.8059	21	.8955

F value = 3.1065 Significance = .0658

Table 3.29
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:12 = Taking your emotional temperature strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	1.8000	.6708	1.8000	5
2	1.7500	.5528	2.7500	10
3	2.4722	.4912	1.9306	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.0313	.5555	6.4806	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2.8085	2	1.4043
WITHIN GROUPS	6.4806	21	.3086

F value = 4.5504 Significance = .0228

Table 3.30
Independent variable: Fator3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:13 = Asking questions strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	3.6000	.5477	1.2000	5
2	3.2500	1.0607	10.1250	10
3	3.6667	.7500	4.5000	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.4792	.8681	15.8250	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.9146	2	.4573
WITHIN GROUPS	15.8250	21	.7536

F value = .6068 Significance = .5544

Table 3.31
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:14 = Co-operating with others strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	3.0000	.9354	3.5000	5
2	2.6000	.8433	6.4000	10
3	3.2222	.9718	7.5556	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	2.9167	.9117	17.4556	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	1.8778	2	.9389
WITHIN GROUPS	17.4556	21	.8312

F value = 1.1295 Significance = .3420

Table 3.32
Independent variable: Factor3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS15 = Empathising with others strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	3.2000	.4482	.8000	5
2	3.5000	.8165	6.0000	10
3	3.0556	1.0737	9.2222	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.2708	8735	16.0222	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.9674	2	.4837
WITHIN GROUPS	16.0222	21	.7630

F value = .6340 Significance = .5403

Table 3.33
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: the average of frequency of fifteen major strategies.

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	2.9000	.2111	.1782	5
2	2.9810	.3551	1.1351	10
3	3.1911	.2950	.6961	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	3.0429	.3093	2.0094	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.3381	2	.1691
WITHIN GROUPS	2.0094	21	.0957

F value = 1.7668 Significance = .1953

CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYSIS

Table 3.34
Correlation coefficient between learners' Integrative Motivation and their 15 major LLS choices

	PRACTISING	REVIEWING AND SENDING MESSAGES	ANALYSING AND REASONING	CREATING STRUCTURE FOR INPUT AND OUTPUT	GUESSING INTELLIGENTLY
COEFFICIENT	.3908	.6179	-.0128	.2367	.3797
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.059	P=.001	P=.953	P=.265	P=.067

	OVERCOMING LIMITATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING	CENTRING YOUR LEARNING	ARRANGING AND PLANNING YOUR LEARNING	EVALUATING YOUR LEARNING	LOWERING YOUR ANXIETY
COEFFICIENT	-.1931	.4799	.3672	.4994	.1369
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.336	P=.018	P=.078	P=.013	P=.524

	ENCOURAGING YOURSELF	TAKING YOUR EMOTIONAL TEMPERATURE	ASKING QUESTIONS	CO-OPERATING WITH OTHERS	EMPATHISING WITH OTHERS
COEFFICIENT	-.0091	.0233	.0303	.1650	.4355
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.966	P=.914	P=.888	P=.441	P=.033

	THE AVERAGE OF FREQUENCY OF FIFTEEN MAJOR STRATEGIES
COEFFICIENT	.4364
CASES	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P = .033

Table 3.35
Correlation coefficient between learners' Instrumental Motivation and their 15 major LLS choices.

	PRACTISING	REVIEWING AND SENDING MESSAGES	ANALYSING AND REASONING	CREATING STRUCTURE FOR INPUT AND OUTPUT	GUESSING INTELLIGENTLY
COEFFICIENT	.2530	.3394	-.0912	.0106	.3245
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.244	P=.105	P=.672	P=.961	P=.122

	OVERCOMING LIMITATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING	CENTRING YOUR LEARNING	ARRANGING AND PLANNING YOUR LEARNING	EVALUATING YOUR LEARNING	LOWERING YOUR ANXIETY
COEFFICIENT	-.2788	.0292	.0520	.0153	-.4804
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.187	P=.892	P=.809	P=.943	P=.017

	ENCOURAGING YOURSELF	TAKING YOUR EMOTIONAL TEMPERATURE	ASKING QUESTIONS	CO-OPERATING WITH OTHERS	EMPATHISING WITH OTHERS
COEFFICIENT	-.3266	-.3429	.0687	-.0553	.4156
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.119	P=.101	P=.750	P=.797	P=.043

	THE AVERAGE OF FREQUENCY OF FIFTEEN MAJOR STRATEGIES
COEFFICIENT	.0017
CASES	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P = .994

Table 3.36
Correlation coefficient between learners' Personality (Sociability) and their 15 major LLS choices

	PRACTISING	REVIEWING AND SENDING MESSAGES	ANALYSING AND REASONING	CREATING STRUCTURE FOR INPUT AND OUTPUT	GUESSING INTELLIGENTLY
COEFFICIENT	-.0451	.3030	-.1161	.1260	.2695
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.834	P=.150	P=.589	P=.557	P=.203

	OVERCOMING LIMITATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING	CENTRING YOUR LEARNING	ARRANGING AND PLANNING YOUR LEARNING	EVALUATING YOUR LEARNING	LOWERING YOUR ANXIETY
COEFFICIENT	-.3649	.0277	.1168	.1359	-.1645
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.080	P=.898	P=.587	P=527	P=.433

	ENCOURAGING YOURSELF	TAKING YOUR EMOTIONAL TEMPERATURE	ASKING QUESTIONS	CO-OPERATING WITH OTHERS	EMPATHISING WITH OTHERS
COEFFICIENT	-.2138	-.2035	-.1684	-.0202	.1801
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.316	P=340	P=.431	P=925	P=.400

	THE AVERAGE OF FREQUENCY OF FIFTEEN MAJOR STRATEGIES
COEFFICIENT	-.0652
CASES	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P = .762

Table 3.37
Overall results of the significance of the relationship between learners' affective factors and their 15 major LLS choices.

		15 major LLS choice				
WAY OF ANALYSIS		PRACTISING	REVIEWING AND SENDING MESSAGES	ANALYSING AND REASONING	CREATING STRUCTURE FOR INPUT AND OUTPUT	GUESSING INTELLIGENTLY
ANOVA	SEX	.9900	.0627*	.2900	.0027***	.7851
CORRELATION	PROFICIENCY	.771	.054*	.360	.859	.182
ANOVA	MAJOR	.9056	.8831	.1340	.2084	.7495
CORRELATION	INTEGRATIVE MOTIVATION	.059*	.001***	.953	.265	.067*
CORRELATION	INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVATION	.233	.105	.672	.961	.122
CORRELATION	SOCIABILITY	.834	.150	.589	.557	.203

		15 major LLS choice				
WAY OF ANALYSIS		OVERCOMING LIMITATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING	CENTRING YOUR LEARNING	ARRANGING AND PLANNING YOUR LEARNING	EVALUATING YOUR LEARNING	LOWERING YOUR ANXIETY
ANOVA	SEX	.4212	.7696	.2340	.7946	.2654
CORRELATION	PROFICIENCY	.186	.402	.684	.813	.937
ANOVA	MAJOR	.1583	.7650	.6230	.3596	.3967
CORRELATION	INTEGRATIVE MOTIVATION	.366	.018**	.078*	.013**	.524
CORRELATION	INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVATION	.187	.892	.809	.943	.017**
CORRELATION	SOCIABILITY	.080*	.898	.587	.527	.443

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

15 major LLS choice

WAY OF ANALYSIS		ENCOURAGING YOURSELF	TAKING YOUR EMOTIONAL TEMPERATURE	ASKING QUESTIONS	CO-OPERATING WITH OTHERS	EMPATHISING WITH OTHERS
ANOVA	SEX	.3354	.0274**	.0642*	.0579*	.2975
CORRELATION	PROFICIENCY	.583	.052*	.507	.985	.029**
ANOVA	MAJOR	.0658*	.0228**	.5544	.3420	.5403
CORRELATION	INTEGRATIVE MOTIVATION	.966	.914	.888	.441	.033**
CORRELATION	INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVATION	.119	.101	.750	.797	.043**
CORRELATION	SOCIABILITY	.316	.340	.431	.925	.400

* = <.10, ** = <.05, *** = <.01

Table 4 The description of the Supplementary questionnaire

Table 4.1 Other strategies used by students.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	9	15	24

Table 4.1.1 Other strategies

STRATEGIES	NUMBER
reading English passages	2
do a group work	1
writing unfamiliar words several times reading them	1
practise the pronunciation of new words in the context	1
go to a movie in English	1
organise the unfamiliar words with semantic group	1
sing English songs	1
talk with native speakers	1
TOTAL	9

Table 4.2 The way of learning the learning strategies (including overlaps)

1. English teacher taught me.
2. I learned them with study-aid books or textbooks.
3. I found them by myself.
4. My friends taught me.
5. My parents or brother/sister taught me. 6. other.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
NUMBER	13	12	19	4	2	3	53

Table 4.2.1 Other way of learning the learning strategies.

WAY OF LEARNING THE LEARNING STRATEGIES	NUMBER
learned by study abroad	2
learned by reading English novels	1
TOTAL	3

The relationship between studying in the intensive English language course and 15 major LLS choice.

Table 5 t-tests for paired samples.
* = <.10, ** = <.05, *** = <.01

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Practising.W1	24	.495	.014	2.8092	.374	.076
Practising.W8				2.6363	.532	.109

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
.1729	.475	.097	1.78	23	.088*
95% CI (-.028, .374)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Reviewing and sending messages.W1	24	.593	.002	3.2917	.765	.156
Reviewing and sending messages.W8				3.8750	.755	.154

Paired Differences Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
-.5833	.686	.140	-4.16	23	.000***
95% CI (-.873, -.294)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Analysing and reasoning. W1	24	.363	.081	3.2000	.767	.157
Analysing and reasoning. W8				3.0417	.755	.154

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
.1583	.859	.175	.90	23	.376
95% CI (-.204, .521)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Creating structure for input and output. W1	24	.281	.183	3.5129	.709	.145
Creating structure for input and output. W8				3.7221	.579	.118

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
-.2092	.779	.159	-1.32	23	.201
95% CI (-.538, .120)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Guessing intelligently. W1	24	.432	.035	3.6875	.919	.188
Guessing intelligently. W8				4.0625	.901	.184

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
-.3750	.970	.198	-1.89	23	.071*
95% CI (-.784, .034)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Overcoming limitation in speaking and writing. W1	24	.241	.257	3.2088	.330	.067
Overcoming limitation speaking and writing. W8				3.4225	.414	.085

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
-.2137	.463	.095	-2.26	23	.034**
95% CI (-.409, -.018)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Centring your learning. W1	24	.493	.014	2.9088	.797	.163
Centring your learning. W8				2.9854	.446	.091

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
-.0767	.696	.142	-.54	23	.594
95% CI (-.370, .217)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Arranging and planning your learning. W1	24	.649	.001	3.4588	.709	.145
Arranging and planning your learning. W8				3.7429	.648	.132

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
-.2842	.571	.117	-2.44	23	.023**
95% CI (-.525, -.043)					

Variables (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Evaluating your learning. W1	24	.385	.063	4.0417	.641	.131
Evaluating your learning. W8				4.5625	.473	.097

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
-.5208	.634	.129	-4.03	23	.001**
95% CI (-.525, -.043)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Lowering your anxiety. W1	24	.597	.002	2.3187	.677	.138
Lowering your anxiety. W8				2.2350	.618	.126

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
.0837	.584	.119	.70	23	.489
95% CI (-.163, .330)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Encouraging yourself. W1	24	.537	.007	2.9450	1.029	.210
Encouraging yourself. W8				2.9583	1.028	.210

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
-.0133	.990	.202	-.07	23	.948
95% CI (-.431, .405)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Taking your emotional temperature. W1	24	.464	.022	2.0313	.636	.130
Taking your emotional temperature. W8				2.4063	.729	.149

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
-.3750	.711	.145	-2.58	23	.017**
95% CI (-.675, -.075)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Asking question. W1	24	.594	.002	3.4792	.853	.174
Asking question W8				3.1458	.801	.163

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
.3333	.747	.152	2.19	23	.039**
95% CI (.018, .649)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Co-operating with others. W1	24	.234	.270	2.9167	.917	.187
Co-operating with others. W8				3.6667	.776	.158

Paired Difference Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Significance
-.7500	1.053	.215	-3.49	23	.002***
95% CI (-.1.195, 1.305)					

Variable (strategies)	Number	Correlation	2-tail Significance	Mean	S.D.	S.E. of Mean
Empathising with others. W1	24	.447	.028	3.2708	.859	.175
Empathising with others. W8				3.5000	.707	.144

Paired Differences			t-value	df	2-tail Significance
Mean	S.D.	SE of Mean			
-.2292	.834	.170	-1.35	23	.191
95% CI (-.581, 123)					

ANOVA analysis: The relationship between learners' Sex and change of their 15 major LLS choices in the intensive English language course

Table 6.1
Independent Variable: Factor 1. Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS:1 = Practising strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	-.1110	.4496	1.8191	10
FEMALE	-.1743	.4634	2.7911	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	-.1479	4578	4.6102	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0234	1	.0234
WITHIN GROUPS	4.6102	22	.2096

F value = .1115 Significance = .7416

Table 6.2
Independent Variable: Factor 1. Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS:2 = Reviewing and sending messages strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	SS	CASES
MALE	1.0500	.5986	3.2250	10
FEMALE	.2500	.5460	3.8750	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.5833	.5681	7.1000	24

SOURCE	SS	df	MENAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	3.7333	1	3.7333
WITHIN GROUPS	7.1000	22	.3227

F value = 11.5681 Significance = .0026

Table 6.3
Independent Variable: Factor 1. Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS:3 = Analysing and reasoning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	-.1400	.9524	8.1640	10
FEMALE	-.1714	.8222	8.7886	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	-.1583	.8778	16.9526	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0058	1	.0058
WITHIN GROUPS	16.9526	22	.7706

F value = .0075 Significance = .9319

Table 6.4
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS:4 = Creating structure for input and output strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	.6010	.8720	6.8437	10
FEMALE	-.0714	.5862	4.4666	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.2088	.7170	11.3103	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2.6376	1	2.6376
WITHIN GROUPS	11.3103	22	.5141

F value = 5.1305 Significance = .0337

Table 6.5
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS: 5 = Guessing intelligently strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	.5500	1.0124	9.2250	10
FEMALE	.2500	.9558	11.8750	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.3750	.9793	21.1000	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.5250	1	.5250
WITHIN GROUPS	21.1000	22	.9591

F value = .5474 Significance = .4672

Table 6.6
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS: 6 = Overcoming limitation in speaking and writing strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	.1690	.7338	4.8467	10
FEMALE	.1793	.4022	2.1027	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.1750	.5620	6.9494	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0006	1	.0006
WITHIN GROUPS	6.9494	22	.3159

F value = .0020 Significance = .9651

Table 6.7
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS:7 = Centring your learning strategies

Value Labels	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	.0320	.7261	4.7456	10
FEMALE	.1114	.7013	6.3930	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.0783	.7115	11.1385	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0368	1	.0368
WITHIN GROUPS	11.1385	22	.5063

F value = .0727 Significance = .7900

Table 6.8
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS:8 = Arranging and planning your learning strategies

Value Labels	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	.2960	.4727	2.0106	10
FEMALE	.2729	.6471	5.4435	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.2825	.5821	7.4541	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0031	1	.0031
WITHIN GROUPS	7.4541	22	.3388

F value = .0092 Significance = .9244

Table 6.9
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS9 = Evaluating your learning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	.7000	.5375	2.6000	10
FEMALE	.3929	.6844	6.0893	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.5208	.6285	8.6893	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.5503	1	.5503
WITHIN GROUPS	8.6893	22	.3950

F value = 1.3933 Significance = .2505

Table 6.10
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS:10 = Lowering your anxiety strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	-.2640	.5141	2.3788	10
FEMALE	.1186	.6984	6.3412	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	-.0408	.6296	8.7200	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.8538	1	.8538
WITHIN GROUPS	8.7200	22	.3964

F value = 2.1540 Significance = .1564

Table 6.11
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS11 = Encouraging yourself strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	-.2000	1.0556	10.0290	10
FEMALE	.2857	.9594	11.9661	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.0833	.9999	21.9951	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	1.3762	1	1.3762
WITHIN GROUPS	21.9951	22	.9998

F value = 1.3765 Significance = .2532

Table 6.12
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS:12 = Taking your emotional temperature strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	.2500	.8079	5.8750	10
FEMALE	.4643	.6494	5.4821	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.3750	.7185	11.3571	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.2679	1	.2679
WITHIN GROUPS	11.3571	22	.5162

F value = .5189 Significance = .4789

Table 6.13
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS:13 = Asking question strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	-.2500	.9501	8.1250	10
FEMALE	-.3929	.5942	4.5893	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	-.3333	.7602	12.7143	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.1190	1	.1190
WITHIN GROUPS	12.7143	22	.5779

F value = .2060 Significance = .6544

Table 6.14
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS:14 = Co-operating with others strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	1.2000	1.1595	12.1000	10
FEMALE	.4286	.8739	9.9286	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.7500	1.0006	22.0286	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	3.4714	1	3.4714
WITHIN GROUPS	22.0286	22	1.0013

F value = 3.4669 Significance = .0760

Table 6.15
Independent Variable: Factor 1: Sex
Dependent Variable: LLS:15 = Empathising with others strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
MALE	.2500	.7169	4.6250	10
FEMALE	.6429	1.7368	39.2143	14
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.4792	1.4116	43.8393	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.9003	1	.9003
WITHIN GROUPS	43.8393	22	1.9927

F value = .4518 Significance = .5085

CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYSIS

Table 6.16
Correlation coefficient between learners' Proficiency and change of their 15 major LLS choices in the intensive English language course.

	PRACTISING	REVIEWING AND SENDING MESSAGES	ANALYSING AND REASONING	CREATING STRUCTURE FOR INPUT AND OUTPUT	GUESSING INTELLIGENTLY
COEFFICIENT	-.3662	-.2346	.2066	-.2718	.0766
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.078	P=.270	P=.333	P=.199	P=.722

	OVERCOMING LIMITATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING	CENTRING YOUR LEARNING	ARRANGING AND PLANNING YOUR LEARNING	EVALUATING YOUR LEARNING	LOWERING YOUR ANXIETY
COEFFICIENT	.0469	.1719	.3052	.1018	-.1271
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.828	P=.422	P=.147	P=.636	P=.554

	ENCOURAGING YOURSELF	TAKING YOUR EMOTIONAL TEMPERATURE	ASKING QUESTION	CO-OPERATING WITH OTHERS	EMPATHISING WITH OTHERS
COEFFICIENT	.0451	.3515	-.1348	.1915	-.1767
CASE	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.834	P=.092	P=.530	P=.370	P=.409

ANOVA analysis: The relationship between learners' Major and change of their 15 major LLS choices in the intensive English language course.

Major 1 = Management, Economics
2 = Law, Sociology, Politics, International relations
3 = Linguistics, English literature, American culture

Table 6.17
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS: 1 = Practising strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	-.2260	.3071	.3771	5
2	-.1150	.5092	2.3337	10
3	-.1411	.4849	1.8811	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	-.1479	.4676	4.5919	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.0417	2	.0209
WITHIN GROUPS	4.5919	21	.2187

F value = .0954 Significance = .9094

Table 6.18
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:2 = Reviewing and sending messages strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.2000	.5701	1.3000	5
2	.7500	.7546	5.1250	10
3	.6111	.6509	3.3889	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.5833	.6836	9.8139	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	1.0194	2	.5097
WITHIN GROUPS	9.8139	21	.4673

F value = 1.0907 Significance = .3543

Table 6.19
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable LLS:3 = Analysing and reasoning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.3600	.6693	1.7920	5
2	-.2800	.8954	7.2160	10
3	-.3111	.8838	6.2489	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	-.1583	.8524	15.2569	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	1.7014	2	.8507
WITHIN GROUPS	15.2569	21	.7265

F value = 1.1710 Significance = .3295

Table 6.20
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable LLS:4 = Creating structure for input and output strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.1340	.7669	2.3525	5
2	.3020	1.0591	10.0948	10
3	.1467	.4109	1.3510	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.2088	.8106	13.7983	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.1496	2	.0748
WITHIN GROUPS	13.7983	21	.6571

F value = .1138 Significance = .8930

Table 6.21
Independent variable Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable LLS:5 = Guessing intelligently strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.5000	.6124	1.5000	5
2	.5500	1.0124	9.2250	10
3	.1111	1.1118	9.8889	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.3750	.9908	20.6139	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	1.0111	2	.5056
WITHIN GROUPS	20.6139	21	.9816

F value = .5150 Significance = .6048

Table 6.22
Independent variable Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable LLS:6 = Overcoming limitation in speaking and writing strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.4860	.4155	.6905	5
2	.0770	.7238	4.7150	10
3	.1111	.3406	.9281	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.1750	.5492	6.3336	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.6164	2	.3082
WITHIN GROUPS	6.3336	21	.3016

F value = 1.0218 Significance = .3771

Table 6.23
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:7 = Centring your learning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.3960	.6412	1.6449	5
2	.0370	.7122	4.5654	10
3	-.0522	.7323	4.2900	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.0783	.7071	10.5003	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.6750	2	.3375
WITHIN GROUPS	10.5003	21	.5000

F value = .6750 Significance = .5198

Table 6.24
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:8 = Arranging and planning your learning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.3320	.6241	1.5579	5
2	.3480	.4866	2.1314	10
3	.1822	.6729	3.6224	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.2825	.5901	7.3116	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.1457	2	.0728
WITHIN GROUPS	7.3116	21	.3482

F value = .2092 Significance = .8129

Table 6.25
!ndependent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:9 = Evaluating your learning strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.7000	.9083	3.3000	5
2	.6000	.5164	2.4000	10
3	.333	.6124	3.0000	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.5208	.6437	8.7000	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.5396	2	.2698
WITHIN GROUPS	8.7000	21	.4143

F value = .6512 Significance = .5316

Table 6.26
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:10 = Lowering your anxiety strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.4660	.8001	2.5609	5
2	-.1980	.5461	2.6838	10
3	-.1478	.5804	2.6948	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	-.0408	.6149	7.9394	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	1.6343	2	.8172
WITHIN GROUPS	7.9394	21	.3781

F value = 2.1614 Significance = .1401

Table 6.27
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:11 = Encouraging yourself strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.8660	.9870	3.8969	5
2	-.2670	.9397	7.9472	10
3	.0378	.9499	7.2184	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.0833	.9528	19.0625	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	4.3088	2	2.1544
WITHIN GROUPS	19.0625	21	.9077

F value = 2.3734 Significance = .1177

Table 6.28
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:12 = Taking your emotional temperature strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.7500	.6374	1.6250	5
2	.4750	.7115	4.5563	10
3	.0556	.6821	3.7222	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.3750	.6867	9.9035	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	1.7215	2	.8608
WITHIN GROUPS	9.9035	21	.4716

F value = 1.8252 Significance = .1858

Table 6.29
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:13 = Asking questions strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	-.3000	.7583	2.3000	5
2	-.4500	.9265	7.7250	10
3	-.2222	.5652	2.5556	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	-.3333	.7740	12.5806	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	.2528	2	.1264
WITHIN GROUPS	12.5806	21	.5991

F value = .2110 Significance = .8115

Table 6.30
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:14 = Co-operating with others strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.7000	1.1511	5.3000	5
2	1.0500	1.1414	11.7250	10
3	.4444	.9167	6.7222	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.7500	1.0634	23.7472	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	1.7528	2	.8764
WITHIN GROUPS	23.7472	21	1.1308

F value = .7750 Significance = .4734

Table 6.31
Independent variable: Factor 3 Major
Dependent variable: LLS:15 = Empathising with others strategies

Value Label	MEAN	S.D.	S.S.	CASES
1	.2000	.2739	.3000	5
2	.0000	6236	3.5000	10
3	1.1667	2.0616	14.0000	9
WITHIN GROUPS TOTAL	.4792	1.3416	37.8000	24

SOURCE	S.S.	df	MEAN.S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	6.9396	2	3.4698
WITHIN GROUPS	37.8000	21	1.8000

F value = 1.9277 Significance = .1704

CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ANALYSIS

Table 6.32 Correlation coefficient between learners' Integrative Motivation and change of their 15 major LLS choices in the intensive English language course

	PRACTISING	REVIEW AND SENDING MESSAGES	ANALYSING AND REASONING	CREATING STRUCTURE FOR INPUT AND OUTPUT	GUESSING INTELLIGENTLY
COEFFICIENT	.423	-.2022	.0237	-.0602	.1732
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.844	P=.343	P=.912	P=.780	P=.418

	OVERCOMING LIMITATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING	CENTRING YOUR LEARNING	ARRANGING AND PLANNING YOUR LEARNING	EVALUATING YOUR LEARNING	LOWERING YOUR ANXIETY
COEFFICIENT	.0692	-.3240	.1787	-.4842	-.1733
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.748	P=.122	P=.403	P=.017	P=.418

	ENCOURAGING YOURSELF	TAKING YOUR EMOTIONAL TEMPERATURE	ASKING QUESTIONS	CO-OPERATING WITH OTHERS	EMPATHISING WITH OTHERS
COEFFICIENT	.0530	-.1597	.2447	.0933	.2613
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.806	P=.456	P=.249	P=.665	P=.217

Table 6.33 Correlation coefficients between learners' Instrumental Motivation and difference of their 15 major LLS choices in the intensive English language course.

	PRACTISING	REVIEWING AND SENDING MESSAGES	ANALYSING AND REASONING	CREATING STRUCTURE FOR INPUT AND OUTPUT	GUESSING INTELLIGENTLY
COEFFICIENT	-.1490	-.2375	-.0031	-.1326	-.0639
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.487	P=.264	P=.988	P=.537	P=.767

	OVERCOMING LIMITATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING	CENTRING YOUR LEARNING	ARRANGING AND PLANNING YOUR LEARNING	EVALUATING YOUR LEARNING	LOWERING YOUR ANXIETY
COEFFICIENT	-.0181	.0357	.1830	-.0925	.3195
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.933	P=.869	P=.392	P=.667	P=.120

	ENCOURAGING YOURSELF	TAKING YOUR EMOTIONAL TEMPERATURE	ASKING QUESTIONS	CO-OPERATING WITH OTHERS	EMPATHISING WITH OTHERS
COEFFICIENT	.2774	.1201	.1063	.1536	-.1737
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.189	P=.576	P=.621	P=.474	P=.417

Table 6.34 Correlation coefficient between learners' Personality (Sociability) and change of 15 major LLS choices in the intensive English language course.

	PRACTISING	REVIEWING AND SENDING MESSAGES	ANALYSING AND REASONING	CREATING STRUCTURE FOR INPUT AND OUTPUT	GUESSING INTELLIGENTLY
COEFFICIENT	-.0751	-.2972	-.0695	-.2499	-.2237
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.727	P=.158	P=.747	P=.239	P=.293

	OVERCOMING LIMITATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING	CENTRING YOUR LEARNING	ARRANGING AND PLANNING YOUR LEARNING	EVALUATING YOUR LEARNING	LOWERING YOUR ANXIETY
COEFFICIENT	.0158	.1501	-.0111	-.3700	.0139
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.942	P=.484	P=.959	P=.075	P=.949

	ENCOURAGING YOURSELF	TAKING YOUR EMOTIONAL TEMPERATURE	ASKING QUESTIONS	CO-OPERATING WITH OTHERS	EMPATHISING WITH OTHERS
COEFFICIENT	.0992	.0078	.1688	.0740	.1363
CASES	24	24	24	24	24
2-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	P=.645	P=.971	P=.430	P=.731	P=.526

Table 6.35 Overall results of the significance of the relationship between learners' affective factors and change of their 15 major LLS choices in the intensive English language course

		15 major LLS choice				
WAY OF ANALYSIS		PRACTISING	REVIEWING AND SENDING MESSAGES	ANALYSING AND REASONING	CREATING STRUCTURE FOR INPUT AND OUTPUT	GUESSING INTELLIGENTLY
ANOVA	SEX	.7416	.0026**	.9319	.0337**	.4672
CORRELATION	PROFICIENCY	.078*	.270	.333	.199	.722
ANOVA	MAJOR	.9094	.3543	.3295	.8930	.6048
CORRELATION	INTEGRATIVE MOTIVATION	.844	.343	.912	.780	.418
CORRELATION	INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVATION	.487	.264	.988	.537	.767
CORRELATION	SOCIABILITY	.727	.158	.747	.239	.293

WAY OF ANALYSIS		OVERCOMING LIMITATION IN SPEAKING AND WRITING	CENTRING YOUR LEARNING	ARRANGING AND PLANNING YOUR LEARNING	EVALUATING YOUR LEARNING	LOWERING YOUR ANXIETY
ANOVA	SEX	.9651	.7900	.9244	.2505	.1564
CORRELATION	PROFICIENCY	.828	.422	.147	.636	.554
ANOVA	MAJOR	.3771	.5198	.8129	.5316	.1401
CORRELATION	INTEGRATIVE MOTIVATION	.748	.122	.403	.017**	.418
CORRELATION	INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVATION	.933	.869	.392	.667	.120
CORRELATION	SOCIABILITY	.942	.484	.959	.075*	.949

WAY OF ANALYSIS		ENCOURAGING YOURSELF	TAKING YOUR EMOTIONAL TEMPERATURE	ASKING QUESTIONS	CO-OPERATING WITH OTHERS	EMPATHISING WITH OTHERS
ANOVA	SEX	.2532	.4789	.6544	.0760*	.5085
CORRELATION	PROFICIENCY	.834	.092*	.530	.370	.409
ANOVA	MAJOR	.1177	.1858	.8115	.4734	.1704
CORRELATION	INTEGRATIVE MOTIVATION	.806	.456	.249	.665	.217
CORRELATION	INSTRUMENTAL MOTIVATION	.189	.576	.621	.474	.417
CORRELATION	SOCIABILITY	.645	.971	.430	.731	.526

* = <.10, ** = <.05

Appendix C

The result of Part B of the second questionnaire

1. Have your learning strategy choice changed because of this intensive English course?

a) has changed very much b) has changed a little bit c) has not changed at all

	a)	b)	c)	TOTAL
NUMBER	4	17	3	24

2.

2.1. Describe which aspects as follows have changed.

a) The way of memorising new words, phrases, and idioms has changed.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	8	13	21

a-1)

-began to memorise the new words, phrases, and idioms using them in a real world. (4)
-began to guess the meaning of the unfamiliar words. (1)
-began to memorise the unfamiliar words listening them in a real world. (1)
-began to memorise the unfamiliar words in the context. (1)
-began to use the English-English dictionary in stead of English-Japanese dictionary. (1)

b) The attitude in the class has changed.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	12	9	21

b-1)

-began to speak English more in the class (question, presentation, opinion etc.) (5)
-began to prepare for the class. (3)
-began to pay much more attention in the class. (2)
-began to review the class. (1)
-began to participate the class with clear object. (1)

c) The way of coping with the problem which you come across in your English study has changed.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	16	5	21

c-1)
-began to write down the unfamiliar words and look up the dictionary.(9)
-began to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words. (6)
-began to ask native speakers for help. (1)

d) The attitude to study, the purpose of study, or the way of making study plan has changed.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	9	12	21

d-1)
-began to have clear object to attend the class. (6)
-began to pay much more attention.(3)

e) The way how I control my feeling about language study has changed.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	5	16	21

e-1)
-began to do the easier things.(1)
-began to have a break.(2)
-began to control my feeling.(2)

f) I have become to study with other students or native speakers.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	13	8	21

f-1)
-sometimes, began to speak English even with Japanese friends. (6)
-began to speak with native speakers. (3)
-began to study with other students. (3)
-irrelevant answer. (1)

g) Has anything else changed in your way of studying?

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	8	13	21

g-1)
-began to use English in speaking and in writing. (5)
-began to study harder. (1)
-began to organise what to study. (1)
-began to enjoy studying. (1)

2-2. Why has your way of studying changed?
(one student did not answer this question)
a) because the teaching method here is different from it in Japan.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	10	10	20

a-1)
-began to contribute more in the class. (5)
-began to use English more in the class. (4)
-irrelevant answer. (1)

b) because living or study environment has changed.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	15	5	20

b-1)
-began to use English much more here. (8)
-began to plan or organise what to study. (3)
-began to be more positive. (1)
-began to feel inferiority because other students could speak English better than me. (1)
-began to have clear goal. (1)
-irrelevant answer. (1)

c) because of other reasons.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	2	18	20

c-1)
-everything helped me to improve my English ability.(1)
-living and study environment was very different from Japan. (1)

3.
3.1. Why has not your learning strategy changed at all?

a) Because the learning strategy that I used in Japan is suited to me.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	2	1	3

b) Because the learning strategy that I used in Japan is suited to this school.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	1	2	3

c) Because I do not want to change my learning strategy.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	2	1	3

d) Because of other reasons.

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	1	2	3

d-1)
-Because I did not want to think about learning strategy at all. I just tried to use English when I studied.

4. Please answer the difference between the class in Japan and the class in the intensive English language course.

Japan

a) the number of students in one class

	0~10	11~20	21~30	31~40	41~50	51~	TOTAL	MEAN
NUMBER	0	5	3	6	8	2	24	35.7

group activity

	YES	NO	TOTAL
NUMBER	5	19	24

the number of the students in one group

	0~4	5~8	9~12	13~16	TOTAL	MEAN
NUMBER	2	1	0	2	5	4.7

b) the proportion of English used by a teacher in the class

	0~25%	26~50%	51~75%	76%~	TOTAL
NUMBER	9	7	4	4	24

c) the proportion of utterance (including discussion within the group) used by students in the class (including both English and Japanese)

	0~25%	26~50%	51~75%	76%~	TOTAL
NUMBER	10	10	2	2	24

d) the proportion of utterance in English in the class

	0~25%	26~50%	51~75%	76%~	TOTAL
NUMBER	15	2	3	4	24

e) Please describe the teaching method in the class as much as you can
-translate the English book into Japanese.(10)
-teacher makes students say their opinion about the lecture. (3)
-explaining the content of textbook by lecturer.(2)
-listen to the tape that English conversation is recorded and answer the question. (1)
-discussion and lecture.(1)
-discuss the questions between students and find the solution. (1)
-lecture. (1)
-discussion. (1)
-discussion and presentation. (1)
-teach grammar. (1)
-follow the teacher's instruction. (1)
-irrelevant answer. (1)

BRITAIN (the intensive English language course)

a) the number of groups in the classroom
-3 groups

the number of students in one group
-8 students

b)the proportion of utterance (including discussion with the group) used by students in the class (including both English and Japanese).

	0~25%	26~50%	51~75%	76%~	TOTAL
NUMBER	2	7	8	7	24

c) the proportion of utterance in English in the class.

	0~25%	26~50%	51~75%	76%~	TOTAL
NUMBER	0	2	0	22	24

d) Please describe the teaching method used in the class as much as you can.(the answer includes overlaps)

-read the article and summarise it and then, discuss it .(14)
-explanation about the grammar(4)
-learn by doing activity. (1)
-irrelevant answer. (4)
-no answer (2)

Appendix D

The result of the questionnaire for teachers

1. Which method did you use in the class? (go to 2)

experimental learning approach, communication language reading. (J)

communicative approach, interactive teaching, group work, pair work, individual work. (A)

I did not use a particular method, but drew on a range of methodology as I thought appropriate. (D)

A1, A3, A4, A5, A6, A11, A13, A14, A15, C18, C20, C21, C23, C24, C25, F26, F27, G29, G30, G32, G34, I39, I40, I41, I42, L50, J44, 45, M54, M55, O56, O57, P58, P59, R60, R61. (M)

2. Why did you use 1 in the class? (go to 3)

to give students opportunities to be active, to use language, to have feedback (tutor and peer), to communicate using English in oral and written form. (J)

To allow the students to use the language, and learn to express themselves in it. To give them the opportunity to exchange ideas between themselves, and to find the confidence in group and pair work to express themselves. (A)

I have been teaching very different components and in any case I don't want to be tied to a method. (D)

Because these strategies come usually to my style of teaching and interesting, or because they are components if the syllabus of learning skills. (M)

3. Do you see any distinction between language learning strategies and learning styles?

Yes (go to 3-1) (3 teachers) No (go to 4) (1 teacher)

3-1. What do you see as the distinction? (go to 4)

Strategies seem to be skills which can be demonstrated, taught, learned. Styles are more personal. We can talk about differences but can't expect to change personalities. (J)

Language learning strategies are methods students adopt to learn aspects of language whereas learning styles relate to students' approach to language learning depending on their particular personalities. (A)

It would seem obvious that certain strategies are more attractive to students with different learning styles than others. (M)

4. Did you notice any characteristics of JYA students' language learning strategy choices?

Yes (go to 4-1) (all teachers) No (go to 5) (none)

4-1. Please explain in detail the characteristics of JYA students' language learning strategy choices. (go to 5)

(J)

- Students used to teacher led activities and heavy direction. Therefore passive classes where students rarely participate.
- reading at one speed - for accuracy, with dictionary, little inference, little risk-taking.
- unwillingness to speak unless they feel confident that utterance is grammatically perfect and profound.

(A)

- An impression I had at first is that they appear familiar with teacher-centred learning rather than student-centred learning. They have, however, responded well to the latter in my classes.
- Very dictionary or book dependent. They seem to prefer the assistance of the written word rather than automatically thinking for themselves.
- They seem very much at home with the receptive skills - reading and listening and more comfortable with these rather than the active skills of speaking and writing.

(M)

- I cannot give detailed characteristics because I do not have an in depth knowledge of my group. Superficially, I have observed a tendency to record everything unselectively in note form.

(D)

1) They were prepared to participate actively.
2) They wanted to use English all the time in lessons.
3) They always had the prop of a Japanese/English dictionary.
4) They noted down new vocabulary or expressions.

5. Did you encourage JYA students to use specific language learning strategies?

Yes (go to 5-1) (4 teachers) No. (go to 6) (none)

5-1 What kind of strategy did you encourage them to use? (go to 5-2)

(J)

- to ask questions, to learn independently, to adopt varied reading strategies, to be active in class, to strive for perfection less often.

(A)

The use of co-operation and negotiation in skill areas such as speaking and writing (preparation of discussions/peer editing in writing etc.). Encouraging them to express themselves freely in speaking particularly.

(M)

be confident, be outgoing, take every opportunity to listen and speak with other speakers of English, keep diaries, vocabulary notebooks for collocations, seek to clarify and control speakers of English, read, relax, be aware of fluctuations in these progress, feel confident about seeking explanation from tutors etc.

(D)

To be as independent as possible in their learning. To read and listen as much as possible for pleasure. To guess the meaning of words and expressions. To see the main point of texts. To skim and scan.

5-2. Please explain in detail how you encouraged them to use the specific language learning strategies. (go to 6)

(J)

ISS work in wk 2 and 3 on good language learner learning to handbooks. Constant reminders of this. Learner training built into all activities and review of aims, objectives of activities.

(A)
By encouraging group/pair work and by letting them see the success of strategies they might not have otherwise used themselves.

(M)
Please see lesson plans and course outline on JYA '96 file.

(D)
This was done through a variety of lessons.

6. Do you thin the JYA students' language learning strategy choices have changed for this 8 weeks?

Yes (go to 6-1) (3 teachers) No (it is the end of questionnaire if you chose "No" in Question 3) (1 teacher)

6-1. Please explain how JYA students' language learning strategy choices have changed for this 8 weeks? (it is the end of questionnaire if you chose "No" in Question 3)

(J)
Some students are more active in class; read faster, use dictionaries less; have developed ways of learning vocabulary; are less dependent on teacher and use resources centre and environment.

(A)
It is rather difficult to answer this question, as I can only surmise what their actual language learning strategies were at the beginning of the course. However, I have noticed a greater freedom of expression and confidence in their language use which may well be the result of more interactive, student-centred activities.

(D)
1) They are much less dictionary dependent.
2) More independent as learners.
3) More prepared to have a go.

7. Did you notice any characteristics of JYA students' learning styles?

Yes (go to 7-1) (1 teacher) 1 teacher between Yes and No

7-1. Please explain in detail the characteristics of JYA students' learning styles. (go to 8)

(J)
- quietly spoken, modest women.
- acceptance of group learning, but inability (often) to give individual opinion.
- reticence in class: fear of upsetting others, fear of making mistakes.

- absence of dictionary leads to great anxiety.
- expectation that we can/do teach writing by giving models.
- easily discouraged (e.g. regards to speaking, listening)

(A)
Again, this is difficult to answer, as I probably had some preconceptions about Japanese learning styles, expecting them to be similar to Chinese styles with which I am reasonably familiar. I anticipated more individuality, 'self-contained', learning styles relying quite heavily on note, but in fact found the JYA students much more open to different teaching ideas and willing to contribute ideas quite freely.

8. Did you encourage JYA students to use the specific learning style?

Yes (go to 8-1) (2 teachers)

8-1 What kind of learning style did you encourage them to use? (go to 8-2)

(J)
to be bold, to try to be outgoing, to accept difficulties

(A)
Again, a more co-operative style, interacting with fellow students and reader.

8-2. Please explain in detail how you encouraged them to use the learning style. (go to 9)

(J)
by creating a non threatening environment, by offering balanced activities/variety of language learning opportunities in flexible groupings.

(A)
Again, by group/pair work-co-operation and negotiation.

9. Do you think that JYA students' learning styles have changed for this 8 weeks?

Yes (go to 9-1) (1 teacher) 1 teacher between Yes and No

9-1. Please explain in detail how they changed their learning styles. (it is the end of questionnaire)

(J)
much harder to effect change or detect change, but many absorb ideas and do try to be flexible/more outgoing/open-minded. Sometimes their own culture and education background are just too powerful and hold them back.
(A)
Again, for some who has had no previous experience of teaching Japanese

students, this is a difficult question to answer, as I'm not sure how far my first impressions were affected by my preconceptions of 'typical Japanese classroom behaviour' Certainly, what I can say at the end of the course is that I have been very pleased with the students' willingness to participate freely in class activities, but may be the students were used to such activities prior to the course, and the initial slight hesitation in this respect was due more to lack of familiarity with the country, and the university system

Appendix E

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Version for Speakers of Other Language Learning English

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)
Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)
(c) R. Oxford, 1989

Directions

This form of the STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL) is for students of English as a second or foreign language. You will find statements about learning English. Please read each statement. On the separate Worksheet, write the response (1,2,3,4,or 5) that tell HOW TRUE OF YOU THE STATEMENT IS.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME means that the statement is very rarely true of you.

USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME means that the statements is true less than half the time.

SOMEWHAT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you about half the time.

USUALLY TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true more than half the time.

ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you almost always.

Answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are not right or wrong answers to these statements. Put your answers on the separate Worksheet. Please make no marks on the items. Work as quickly as you can without being careless. This usually takes about 20-30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, let the teacher know immediately.
(Version 7.0 [ESL/EFL] (c) R. L. Oxford, 1989)

EXAMPLE

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

Read the item, and choose a response (1 through 5 as above), and write it in the space after the item.

I actively seek out opportunities to talk with native speakers of English.

_____

You have just completed the example item. Answer the rest of the items on the Worksheet.

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning
Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)
(c) R. Oxford, 1989

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

(Write answers on Worksheet)

Part A

1. I think of relationship between what I already know and new things I learn in English.

2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.

3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.

4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.

5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.

6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.

7. I physically act out new English words.

8. I review English lessons often.

9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.

Part B

10. I say or write new English words several times.

11. I try to talk like native English speakers.

12. I practice the sounds of English.

13. I use the English words I know in different ways.

14. I start conversations in English.

15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.

16. I read for pleasure in English.

17. I write note, messages, letters, or reports in English.

18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.

20. I try to find patterns in English.

21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.

22. I try not to translate word-for-word.

23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.

Part C

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guess.

25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.

26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.

27. I read English without looking up every new word.

28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.

29. If I can't think of an English word, I use word or phrase that means the same thing.

Part D

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.

31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.

32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.

33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.

34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.

35. I look for people I can talk to in English.

36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.

37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.

38. I think about my progress in learning English.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

Part E

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.

40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.

41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.

42. I notice if an tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.

43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.

44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

Part F

45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.

46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.

47. I practice English with other students.

48. I ask for help from English speakers.

49. I ask questions in English.

50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

Your Name _____ Date _____

SILL Worksheet

Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)

(c) R. Oxford, 1989

1. The blanks (_____) are numbered for each item on the SILL.

2. Write your response to each item (that is, write 1,2,3,4, or 5) in each of the blanks.

Part A	Part B	Part C	Part D	Part E	Part F
1._____	10._____	24._____	30._____	39._____	45._____
2._____	11._____	25._____	31._____	40._____	46._____
3._____	12._____	26._____	32._____	41._____	47._____
4._____	13._____	27._____	33._____	42._____	48._____
5._____	14._____	28._____	34._____	43._____	49._____
6._____	15._____	29._____	35._____	44._____	50._____
7._____	16._____		36._____		
8._____	17._____		37._____		
9._____	18._____		38._____		
	19._____				
	20._____				
	21._____				
	22._____				
	23._____				

Appendix F Questionnaires employed in the present study.

F-1

BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill in the blank in English.

1: Name_____2:Date_____

3: Age_____ 4: Sex. Male • Female (Circle) 5: Nationality_____

6: Score of TOEFL or IELTS _____

7: What is your major in your university?_____

8: How long have you been studying English? _____ years.

9: How do you rate your overall proficiency in English as compared with the proficiency of other people in your country? (Circle one)

Excellent Good Fair Poor

10: How do you rate your overall proficiency in English as compared with the proficiency of native speakers of English? (Circle one)

Excellent Good Fair Poor

11: How important is it for you to become proficient in English? (Circle one)

Very important Important Not so important

12: What do you think about yourself? Sociable Not sociable (Circle one)

13: Why do you learn English? (Tick 4 all that apply)

____ interested in the language.
____ interested in the culture
____ want friends who speak the language
____ have friends who speak the language
____ required to take a language course to graduate
____ need it for my career
____ need it for travel
____ other (list):_____
_____

14: Do you enjoy (or have you enjoyed) language learning?

Yes No (Circle one)

15: What other languages have you studied?_____

QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT LEARNING STRATEGIES

INSTRUCTION

The following statements are what you do in your English learning (it is called "LEARNING STRATEGIES"). Please just remember how you studied English in your university or the other language institution in your country. Read each statement and choose your response (1 through 5 as below),and write it in the answer sheet.

Choice of your response (1 through 5) tells HOW OFTEN YOU REALLY DO EACH STATEMENT.

1. I never or almost never do it.
2. I occasionally do it.
3. I sometimes do it.
4. I often do it.
5. I always or almost always do it.

Please answer what you REALLY do. Do not answer what you should do, or other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. This questionnaire takes about 20-30 minutes to complete. If you have questions, let me know immediately.

Keep bearing in your mind that you will be required to answer the same question again in the same way. The date will be decided very soon. So please keep this questionnaire in your notebook and try to use these strategies to learn English.

Choice of your response

1. I never or almost never do it.
2. I occasionally do it.
3. I sometimes do it.
4. I often do it.
5. I always or almost always do it.

Part 1

1. I classify new words into meaningful units (e.g. type of word, topic etc.) when I memorise them.

2. I classify new things into meaningful units (e.g. type of sentence structure, grammar etc.) when I study them.

3. I use new words in a sentence so I can memorise them.

4. I connect the sound, the image, and the picture of the new word to help me memorise the word.

5. When I memorise the new words, I memorise them by the way how I write a key concept at the centre or at the top, and write related words and concepts linked with the key concept with lines or arrows.
(e.g. computer - display, hard ware, floppy disc, soft ware etc.)

6. When I memorise the new words, I memorise them with some words in Japanese that sound like them
[e.g. lamentable ⇒ ramen taberu = Some one eats noodle.
⇓
ramen-shika taberenai = Some one can only eat noodle.
⇓
kawaisou, nagekawashii (the definition of "lamentable")

7. I use rhymes to memorise new words. (e.g. able, capable, reasonable)

8. I review English lessons.

9. I memorise new words with physical action.

10. I use cards with the new word on the one side, and the definition or information on the other.

11. I say or write new words several times to memorise them.

12. I practice the typical pronunciation of English that Japanese does not have. (e.g. Japanese does not have the distinction between [l] and [r])

13. I memorise the routine phrases or sentences of English. (e.g. How are you? It is time to ~)

14. I use the new words I know in different ways.

15. I use or learn English outside classroom. (e.g. making conversation in English with friends, watching English language TV programs, or going to movies spoken in English)

16. When I read English passage, I first read over the passage quickly, and then, go back and read it carefully.

17. I read English books or magazines for pleasure.

18. I try to find patterns in English.

19. I find the meaning of the new word by dividing it into parts that I understand. (e.g. restructure = re+structure)

20. I try to compare the differences and similarities between English and Japanese.

21. Normally, I try not to translate English passage into Japanese word-for-word.

22. I try to find the similarities of structures or concepts between English and Japanese, and try to apply them from Japanese to English.

23. I write down the main ideas or specific points in the English class.

24. I make summaries of the English passages or stories that are used in the English class.

25. I use some emphasis techniques. (e.g. underlining, starring, colour-coding) when I study English.

Part 2

26. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make a guess the meaning.

27. When I listen someone's speech in English, I try to guess what the person will say next.

28. When I can't remember a word during a conversation in English, I use Japanese.

29. I ask someone for help to provide the missing expression in English.

30. When I can't remember a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.

31. I try to avoid speaking a difficult topic in English.

32. I try to speak English with easier words.

33. I make up new words (paperholder for notebook)

34. If I can't remember a word during a conversation in English, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

Part 3

35. When I prepare the English class, I try to link the new knowledge with already known one.

36. I pay attention in the English class.

37. I don't speak English until my listening skills are better developed.

38. I try to find as many ways as I can to use English.

39. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.

40. I have clear goals for improving in learning English.

41. I decide the purpose of a particular language task.
(e.g. listening to the radio to catch the content of the news, writing a letter to persuade a friend to do something)

42. When I do a language task, I make a plan how to do it. (e.g. describing the task, determining its requirements, etc.)

43. When I was in Japan, I wanted to use English outside classroom.

44. I use my English mistakes to help me do better.

45.I think about my progress in learning English.

Part 4

46. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.

47. I study English listening to soothing music (e.g. classic) to relax.

48. I study English watching TV to relax.

49. I say or write some positive statements about learning English to encourage myself. (e.g. ganbare, faito etc.)

50. I try to talk a difficult topic with native speakers of English.

51. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.

52. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.

53. I use a checklist to discover my feeling, attitude, and motivations concerning language learning.

54. I write down my feeling in a language learning diary.

55. I talk to someone else about when I have trouble in learning English.

Part 5

56. If I don't understand something in English, I ask the speaker to slow down or say it again.

57. I ask native speakers of English to correct me when I talk.

58. I practice English with other students.

59. I ask for help from native speakers of English when I come across unfamiliar word or phrase.

60. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

61. I become aware of native speakers' thoughts and feeling.

ANSWER SHEET

Choice of your response

1. I never or almost never do it.
2. I occasionally do it.
3. I sometimes do it.
4. I often do it.
5. I always or almost always do it.

Part 1

1.___ 2.___ 3.___ 4.___ 5.___ 6.___ 7.___ 8.___ 9.___10.___

11.___12.___13.___14.___15.___16.___17.___18.___19.___20.___

21.____22.____23.____24.____25.____

Part 2

26.____27.____28.____29.____30.____31.____32.____33.____34.____

Part 3

35.___36.___37.___38.___39.___40.___41.___42.___43.___44.___

45.___

Part 4

46.___47.___48.___49.___50.___51.___52.___53.___54.___55.___

Part 5

56.____57.____58.____59.____60.____61.____

Name_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!

F-1 （日本語バージョン）

学習ストラテジーに関する質問

答え方

質問用紙にある文章は、あなたが英語の勉強をするときに今までどうやって勉強してきたか、について述べているものです。ここで言う“勉強”というのは受験勉強など特定されたものでなく、普段の学校（高校、大学など）での英語の授業に対しての“勉強”という意味です。（これは通常学習ストラテジーと呼ばれています）。その文章を一つ一つ読んで下の選択肢から自分にもっとも適しているものを選んで、解答欄に記入してください。選択肢はあなたがどのくらい頻繁にその文章に書かれていることをしているか、を示したものです。

1．一度も、またはほとんど一度もしたことがない
2．たまにしたことがある
3．時々したことがある
4．よくする
5．ほとんどいつもする

注意

調査の信憑性を高めるため、あなたの本当にしていることを答えて下さい。あなたが自分で「これは、実行すべきだ」とか「他の人はこうやっているだろう」と思ったことを答えとして記入してはいけません。

この調査は約30分かかります。もし質問があったら、直接手を上げて聞いて下さい。

この調査は近いうちにもう一度行われます。次回はJYAプログラムで学習してあなたの勉強方法がどのように変化したかを調べるために行われます。

今回使用した質問用紙は返す必要はありません。自分で持っていて英語の学習方法の参考として下さい。

Part 1

1．新出単語を覚えるとき、それを意味や単語の品詞などによって分類して覚える

2．すでに習った事柄と新しく習う事柄とを結び付けて勉強する

3．新出単語を覚えるために、それを別の文章で使ってみる

4．新出単語を覚えるために、その単語の発音と、その単語から連想されるイメージとを結び付けて覚える

5．新出単語を覚えるとき、重要な概念を一番上に書いてその下にそれに関連する単語を線や矢印でつなげて、大まかな意味ごとに分けて覚える

6．新出単語を覚えるとき、日本語で似た発音の言葉とつなげて覚える
（例　lamentable＝ラーメン食べる
↓
ラーメンしか食べれない
↓
かわいそう、嘆かわしい（lamentableの意味）

7．新出単語を覚えるとき、韻を使って覚える（例　able, capable, reasonable）

8．英語の授業の復習をする

9．新出単語を覚えるとき、動作を使って覚える

10．新出単語を覚えるとき、単語カードの表に新出単語、裏にその意味や他の情報（発音、アクセント）を書いて覚える

11．何回も書いたり言ったりして新出単語を覚える

12．英語の音、発音を日本語のそれと区別できるように練習する

13．英語の決まり文句やイディオムなどをよく覚える

14．既に知っている英単語を違う用法で使う

15．授業以外でも英語を使ったり学習したりしている

16．英文を読むとき、最初はざっと要点だけつかんで、それからじっくりもう一回読む

17．授業で使うテキストの他に英語の本や雑誌を読む

１８．英語独特のパターンを見つけられるように努力している。

１９．英単語の意味が分からないとき、自分が理解できるように単語を分解して意味を考える。
（例　restructure → re + structure = もう一度＋組織＝再組織、再構築）

２０．英語と日本語の違いや、似ているところを比べながら勉強する。

２１．普段英語を読むとき、逐語訳をしないようにしている。

２２．日本語と英語の構造や概念の似ているところを見つけて、似ているところが見つかったら、日本語の概念や構造を英語に当てはめて理解しようとする。

２３．英語の授業で大事なところをノートに書く。

２４．英語の授業で使われるテキストの英文の要約をする。

２５．ノートやテキストにアンダーラインや印をつけて重要なポイントが解りやすいようにしている。

Part 2

２６．わからない英単語があってもすぐに辞書を引かずに、意味を想像してみる。

２７．英語で話しを聞いているとき、その人が次に何を言うのか予想しながら聞いている。

２８．英語で友達と話をしているとき、わからない表現がでてきたら、日本語でその部分を言う。

２９．英語でわからない表現が出てきたら、他の人に教えてもらう。

３０．英語で話しをしているときにわからない単語や表現がでてきた時は、ジェスチャーを使う。

３１．英語で話しをするとき、難しい話題は避ける。

３２．簡単な単語や表現を使って英語を話そうとする。

３３．自分で新しい英単語を作ることがある。

３４．もし英語で話しをしていて、単語や表現がわからないとき、同じような意味をあらわす別の単語を使う。

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Part 3

３５．英語の授業を予習をするとき、新しい事柄と、もう既に習った事柄とを結び付けようとする

３６．英語の授業を真剣に受けている

３７．自分のヒアリングの力が十分につくまで、英語は話さないようにしている

３８．自分が英語を使う方法を、できるだけ多く見つけようとしている

３９．英語を勉強する時間が十分できるように計画を立てている

４０．英語を上達させるためのはっきりとした目的、目標を持っている

４１．自分で英語の勉強をするときの目的が分かっている
（例　ニュースの内容を理解するために英語のラジオ放送を聞く
海外の友達に自分の気持ちを伝えるために手紙を書く）

４２　英語の勉強をするとき、どうやってそれをやるのかの計画を立てる

４３．日本にいるとき、授業以外で英語を練習したいと思っていた

４４．自分が英語で間違えたことを自分の英語の力を伸ばすための参考にしている

４５．自分で英語の力がどのくらい伸びたかを考えることがある

Part 4

４６．英語でスピーチをするとき、緊張をほぐすために自分なりにリラックスするようにしている

４７．リラックスするために音楽を聴きながら勉強する

４８．リラックスするためにテレビを見ながら勉強する

４９．自分を励ますために、前向きな言葉を言ったり紙に書いたりしている

５０．ネイティヴの人と難しい話題で話をしようと努力している

５１．英語がうまく使えたときやテストがよかったときは自分で自分を誉めたり、励ましたりしている

５２．英語を勉強したり使ったりしているときに緊張していることが自分でわかる

５３．自分の英語学習に関しての自分の気持ちや態度、そして動機等についてチェックするためのチェックリストを使っている

５４．日記に英語学習についての自分の気持ちやその日の感想などを書いている

５５．英語学習についての悩みを友達と話したりする

Part 5

５６．もし英語で話しを聞いていてわからないところが出てきたら、その人にゆっくり言うように頼むか、もう一度言ってもらうように頼む

５７．自分が英語で話すときにネイティヴに間違いをチェックしてもらうように頼む

５８．他の生徒と英語の練習をする

５９．ネイティヴからわからないところを教えてもらうように頼む

６０．英語を話す人たちの文化を学習するようにしている

６１．ネイティヴの考えや気持ちが解ってきた

ANSWER SHEET (解答欄)

Choice of your response （選択肢）

1．一度も、またはほとんど一度もしたことがない
2．たまにしたことがある
3．時々したことがある
4．よくする
5．ほとんどいつもする

Part 1

1.___ 2.___ 3.___ 4.___ 5.___ 6.___ 7.___ 8.___ 9.___10.___

11.___12.___13.___14.___15.___16.___17.___18.___19.___20.___

21.____22.____23.____24.____25.____

Part 2

26.____27.____28.____29.____30.____31.____32.____33.____34.____

Part 3

35.___36.___37.___38.___39.___40.___41.___42.___43.___44.___

45.___

Part 4

46.___47.___48.___49.___50.___51.___52.___53.___54.___55.___

Part 5

56.____57.____58.____59.____60.____61.____

Name_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!

F-2

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONNAIRE

Instruction

This questionnaire is implemented for supplement the first questionnaire. Please answer the question seriously.

1. What do you think of yourself? (Circle one that applies)

1. not sociable at all 2. not sociable very much 3. undecided 4. sociable

5. very sociable

2. Why do you learn English? (Circle one that applies in each statement)

1. Because I am interested in the language.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

2. Because I am interested in the culture.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

3. Because I want or have friends who speak the language.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

4. Because I have to take an English course to graduate.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

5. Because I need it for my career.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

6. Because I need it for travel.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

7. Other reasons. (list)

_____

_____

3. Please answer the following questions looking the questionnaire about learning strategies.

1. I have ever used other learning strategies. (Circle one)

Yes (go to 2) No (go to 3)

2. Please explain in detail. (go to 3)

_____

_____

_____

3. How did you learn the language learning strategies? (Circle all that apply)

1. English teacher taught me.
2. I learned them with study-aid books or textbooks.
3. I found them by myself.
4. My friends taught me.
5. My parents or brother/sister taught me.
6. Other (Please explain in detail)

_____

_____

Thank you very much for your co-operation!

Name

_____

F-2（日本語バージョン）

BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE補充質問　　１９９６年５月６日実施

今回の質問は前回の質問の補充の意味で行われます。前回と同じように本当に自分が思っていることを答えて下さい。よろしくお願いします。

1. What do you think of yourself? (Circle one that applies)

1. not sociable at all 2. not sociable very much 3. undecided 4. sociable

5. very sociable

2. Why do you learn English? (Circle one that applies in each statement)

1. Because I am interested in the language.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

2. Because I am interested in the culture.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

3. Because I want or have friends who speak the language.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

4. Because I have to take an English course to graduate.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

5. Because I need it for my career.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

6. Because I need it for travel.

1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree 5. strongly agree

7. Other reasons. (list)

_____

_____

3．学習ストラテジーに関する質問を見ながら答えて下さい

1．日本にいるときこの質問以外の勉強方法をしたことがある（どちらかに○をつける）

Yes(2、3へ)　No(3へ)

2．（1でYesと答えた人のみ）具体的にどんな勉強方法をしたか答えてください

_____

_____

_____

3．（全員）あなたは、英語の勉強方法をどうやって身につけましたか
（該当するものすべてに○をつける）

1．英語の先生から教えてもらった
2．参考書、教育雑誌などを見て身につけた
3．自分で勉強方法を見つけた
4．友達から教えてもらった
5．親、兄弟から教えてもらった
6．その他
具体的に書いて下さい

_____

ご協力ありがとうございました　次回もよろしくお願いします

NAME_____
（匿名、偽名などを前回使った人は前回と同じ名前にして下さい）

F-3

THE SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Questionnaire about learning strategies.

INSTRUCTION

The following statements are what you do in your English learning (it is called "LEARNING STRATEGIES"). Please just remember how you studied English in your university or the other language institution in your country. Read each statement and choose your response (1 through 5 as below),and write it in the answer sheet.

Choice of your response (1 through 5) tells HOW OFTEN YOU REALLY DO EACH STATEMENT.

1. I never or almost never do it.
2. I occasionally do it.
3. I sometimes do it.
4. I often do it.
5. I always or almost always do it.

Please answer what you REALLY do. Do not answer what you should do, or other people do. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. This questionnaire takes about 20-30 minutes to complete. If you have questions, let me know immediately.

Choice of your response

1. I never or almost never do it.
2. I occasionally do it.
3. I sometimes do it.
4. I often do it.
5. I always or almost always do it.

Part 1

1. I classify new words into meaningful units (e.g. type of word, topic etc.) when I memorise them.

2. I classify new things into meaningful units (e.g. type of sentence structure, grammar etc.) when I study them.

3. I use new words in a sentence so I can memorise them.

4. I connect the sound, the image, and the picture of the new word to help me memorise the word.

5. When I memorise the new words, I memorise them by the way how I write a key concept at the centre or at the top, and write related words and concepts linked with the key concept with lines or arrows.
(e.g. computer - display, hard ware, floppy disc, soft ware etc.)

6. When I memorise the new words, I memorise them with some words in Japanese that sound like them
[e.g. lamentable ⇒ ramen taberu = Some one eats noodle.
⇓
ramen-shika taberenai = Some one can only eat noodle.
⇓
kawaisou, nagekawashii (the definition of "lamentable")

7. I use rhymes to memorise new words. (e.g. able, capable, reasonable)

8. I review English lessons.

9. I memorise new words with physical action.

10. I use cards with the new word on the one side, and the definition or information on the other.

11. I say or write new words several times to memorise them.

12. I practice the typical pronunciation of English that Japanese does not have. (e.g. Japanese does not have the distinction between [l] and [r])

13. I memorise the routine phrases or sentences of English. (e.g. How are you? It is time to ~)

14. I use the new words I know in different ways.

15. I use or learn English outside classroom. (e.g. making conversation in English with friends, watching English language TV programs, or going to movies spoken in English)

16. When I read English passage, I first read over the passage quickly, and then, go back and read it carefully.

17. I read English books or magazines for pleasure.

18. I try to find patterns in English.

19. I find the meaning of the new word by dividing it into parts that I understand. (e.g. restructure = re+structure)

20. I try to compare the differences and similarities between English and Japanese.

21. Normally, I try not to translate English passage into Japanese word-for-word.

22. I try to find the similarities of structures or concepts between English and Japanese, and try to apply them from Japanese to English.

23. I write down the main ideas or specific points in the English class.
24. I make summaries of the English passages or stories that are used in the English class.

25. I use some emphasis techniques. (e.g. underlining, starring, colour-coding) when I study English.

Part 2

26. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make a guess the meaning.

27. When I listen someone's speech in English, I try to guess what the person will say next.

28. When I can't remember a word during a conversation in English, I use Japanese.

29. I ask someone for help to provide the missing expression in English.

30. When I can't remember a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.

31. I try to avoid speaking a difficult topic in English.

32. I try to speak English with easier words.

33. I make up new words (paperholder for notebook)

34. If I can't remember a word during a conversation in English, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.

Part 3

35. When I prepare the English class, I try to link the new knowledge with already known one.

36. I pay attention in the English class.

37. I don't speak English until my listening skills are better developed.

38. I try to find as many ways as I can to use English.

39. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.

40. I have clear goals for improving in learning English.

41. I decide the purpose of a particular language task.
(e.g. listening to the radio to catch the content of the news, writing a letter to persuade a friend to do something)

42. When I do a language task, I make a plan how to do it. (e.g. describing the task, determining its requirements, etc.)

43. When I was in Japan, I wanted to use English outside classroom.

44. I use my English mistakes to help me do better.

45.I think about my progress in learning English.

Part 4

46. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.

47. I study English listening to soothing music (e.g. classic) to relax.

48. I study English watching TV to relax.

49. I say or write some positive statements about learning English to encourage myself. (e.g. ganbare, faito etc.)

50. I try to talk a difficult topic with native speakers of English.

51. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.

52. I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.

53. I use a checklist to discover my feeling, attitude, and motivations concerning language learning.

54. I write down my feeling in a language learning diary.

55. I talk to someone else about when I have trouble in learning English.

Part 5

56. If I don't understand something in English, I ask the speaker to slow down or say it again.

57. I ask native speakers of English to correct me when I talk.

58. I practice English with other students.

59. I ask for help from native speakers of English when I come across unfamiliar word or phrase.

60. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

61. I become aware of native speakers' thoughts and feeling.

ANSWER SHEET

Choice of your response

1. I never or almost never do it.
2. I occasionally do it.
3. I sometimes do it.
4. I often do it.
5. I always or almost always do it.

A. Questionnaire about learning strategies.

Part 1

1.___ 2.___ 3.___ 4.___ 5.___ 6.___ 7.___ 8.___ 9.___10.___

11.___12.___13.___14.___15.___16.___17.___18.___19.___20.___

21.____22.____23.____24.____25.____

Part 2

26.____27.____28.____29.____30.____31.____32.____33.____34.____

Part 3

35.___36.___37.___38.___39.___40.___41.___42.___43.___44.___

45.___

Part 4

46.___47.___48.___49.___50.___51.___52.___53.___54.___55.___

Part 5

56.____57.____58.____59.____60.____61.____

Name_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!

B. Questionnaire about the intensive English course that you are taking.

Read the following questions and answer them in an appropriate way.

1. Have your learning strategy choice changed because of this intensive English course? Circle one

a) has changed very much (go to 2) b) has changed a little bit (go to 2)

c) has not changed at all. (go to 3)

2.

2-1. Describe which aspects as follows have changed.
Read the following statements and answer them in an appropriate way.

a) The way of memorising new words, phrases, and idioms has changed.
Circle one.

① Yes (go to a)-1) ② No (go to b))

a)-1. Please explain more in detail.

_____

_____

b) The attitude in the class has changed. Circle one.

① Yes (go to b)-1) ② No (go to c))

b)-1. Please explain more in detail.

_____

_____

_____

c) The way of coping with the problem which you come across in your English study has changed. Circle one.

① Yes (go to c)-1) ② No (go to d))

c)-1. Please explain more in detail

_____

_____

_____

d) The attitude to study, the purpose of study, or the way of making study plan has changed. Circle one.

① Yes (go to d)-1) ② No (go to e))

d)-1. Please explain more in detail

_____

_____

_____

e) The way how I control my feeling about language study has changed. Circle one.

① Yes (go to e)-1) ② No (go to f))

e)-1. Please explain more in detail

_____

_____

_____

f) I have begun to study with other students or native speakers. Circle one.

① Yes (go to f)-1) ② No (go to g))

f)-1. Please explain more in detail

_____

_____

_____

g) Has anything else changed in your way of studying? Circle one

① Yes (go to g)-1) ② No (go to 2-2)

g)-1. Please explain more in detail.

2-2. Why has your way of studying changed?
Read the following sentences and answer them in an appropriate way.

a) Because the teaching method here is different from it in Japan.
Circle one.
① Yes (go to a)-1) ② No (go to b))

a)-1. Please explain more in detail.

b) Because living or study environment has changed.
Circle one
① Yes (go to b)-1) ② No (go to c))

b)-1. Please explain more in detail.

c) Because of other reasons.
Circle one
① Yes (go to c)-1) ② No (go to **4**)

c)-1. Please explain more in detail.

3. (answer only the person who has not changed his/her learning strategy choice at all)

3-1. Why has not your learning strategy choice changed at all?
Read the following statements and answer in an appropriate way.

a) Because the learning strategy that I used in Japan is suited to me.
Circle one.
① Yes ② No

b) Because the learning strategy that I used in Japan is suited to this this school. Circle one.
① Yes ② No

c) Because I do not want to change my learning strategy .
Circle one.
① Yes ② No

d) Because of other reasons.
Circle one.
① Yes (go to d)-1) ② No

d)-1. Please explain more in detail

_____

_____

_____

4. Please answer the difference between the class in Japan and the class in this intensive English language course.

Japan

a) The number of students -----_____students per a classroom.

If your class do group activity in the class, please fill in the following blanks.

_____students per a classroom. _____groups per a classroom.

_____students per a group.

b) The proportion of English used by a teacher in the class.
Circle one.

a) 0~25% b) 26~50% c) 51~75% d) 76%~

c) The proportion of utterance (including discussion within the group) used by students in the class (including both English and Japanese). Circle one.

a) 0~25% b) 26~50% c) 51~75% d) 76%~

d) The proportion of utterance of English in the class. Circle one.

a) 0~25% b) 26~50% c) 51~75% d) 76%~

e) Please describe the teaching method used in the class as much as you can.

_____

_____

_____

_____

England

a) _____groups in the classroom._____students per one group.

b) The proportion of utterance (including discussion with the group) used by students in the class (including both English and Japanese). Circle one.

a) 0~25% b) 26~50% c) 51~75% d) 76%~

c) The proportion of utterance of English in the class. Circle one.

a) 0~25% b) 26~50% c) 51~75% d) 76%~

d) Please describe the teaching method used in the class as much as you can.

_____

_____

_____

NAME_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!

F-3 （日本語バージョン）
QUESTIONNAIRE（第二回：6月　日実施）

A. 学習ストラテジーに関する質問

答え方

質問用紙にある文章は、あなたが英語の勉強をするときに今までどうやって勉強してきたか、について述べているものです。ここで言う“勉強”というのは受験勉強など特定されたものでなく、普段の学校（高校、大学など）での英語の授業に対しての“勉強”という意味です。（これは通常学習ストラテジーと呼ばれています）その文章を一つ一つ読んで下の選択肢から自分にもっとも適しているものを選んで、解答欄に記入してください。選択肢はあなたがどのくらい頻繁にその文章に書かれていることをしているか、を示したものです。

1．一度も、またはほとんど一度もしたことがない
2．たまにしたことがある
3．時々したことがある
4．よくする
5．ほとんどいつもする

注意

調査の信憑性を高めるため、あなたの本当にしていることを答えて下さい。あなたが自分で「これは、実行すべきだ」とか「他の人はこうやっているだろう」と思ったことを答えとして記入してはいけません。

Part 1

1．新出単語を覚えるとき、それを意味や単語の品詞などによって分類して覚える

2．すでに習った事柄と新しく習う事柄とを結び付けて勉強する

3．新出単語を覚えるために、それを別の文章で使ってみる

4．新出単語を覚えるために、その単語の発音と、その単語から連想されるイメージとを結び付けて覚える

5．新出単語を覚えるとき、重要な概念を一番上に書いてその下にそれに関連する単語を線や矢印でつなげて、大まかな意味ごとに分けて覚える

6．新出単語を覚えるとき、日本語で似た発音の言葉とつなげて覚える
（例　lamentable＝ラーメン食べる
↓
ラーメンしか食べれない
↓
かわいそう、嘆かわしい（lamentableの意味）

7．新出単語を覚えるとき、韻を使って覚える（例　able, capable, reasonable）

8．英語の授業の復習をする

9．新出単語を覚えるとき、動作を使って覚える

10．新出単語を覚えるとき、単語カードの表に新出単語、裏にその意味や他の情報（発音、アクセント）を書いて覚える

11．何回も書いたり言ったりして新出単語を覚える

12．英語の音、発音を日本語のそれと区別できるように練習する

13．英語の決まり文句やイディオムなどをよく覚える

14．既に知っている英単語を違う用法で使う

15．授業以外でも英語を使ったり学習したりしている

16．英文を読むとき、最初はざっと要点だけつかんで、それからじっくりもう一回読む

17．授業で使うテキストの他に英語の本や雑誌を読む

１８．英語独特のパターンを見つけられるように努力している

１９．英単語の意味が分からないとき、自分が理解できるように単語を分解して意味を考える
（例　restructure → re + structure = もう一度＋組織＝再組織、再構築）

２０．英語と日本語の違いや、似ているところを比べながら勉強する

２１．普段英語を読むとき、逐語訳をしないようにしている

２２．日本語と英語の構造や概念の似ているところを見つけて、似ているところが見つかったら、日本語の概念や構造を英語に当てはめて理解しようとする

２３．英語の授業で大事なところをノートに書く

２４．英語の授業で使われるテキストの英文の要約をする

２５．ノートやテキストにアンダーラインや印をつけて重要なポイントが解りやすいようにしている

Part 2

２６．わからない英単語があってもすぐに辞書を引かずに、意味を想像してみる

２７．英語で話しを聞いているとき、その人が次に何を言うのか予想しながら聞いている

２８．英語で友達と話をしているとき、わからない表現がでてきたら、日本語でその部分を言う

２９．英語でわからない表現が出てきたら、他の人に教えてもらう

３０．英語で話しをしているときにわからない単語や表現がでてきた時は、ジェスチャーを使う

３１．英語で話しをするとき、難しい話題は避ける

３２．簡単な単語や表現を使って英語を話そうとする

３３．自分で新しい英単語を作ることがある

３４．もし英語で話しをしていて、単語や表現がわからないとき、同じような意味をあらわす別の単語を使う

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Part 3

３５．英語の授業を予習をするとき、新しい事柄と、もう既に習った事柄とを結び付けようとする。

３６．英語の授業を真剣に受けている。

３７．自分のヒアリングの力が十分につくまで、英語は話さないようにしている。

３８．自分が英語を使う方法を、できるだけ多く見つけようとしている。

３９．英語を勉強する時間が十分できるように計画を立てている。

４０．英語を上達させるためのはっきりとした目的、目標を持っている。

４１．自分で英語の勉強をするときの目的が分かっている。
（例　ニュースの内容を理解するために英語のラジオ放送を聞く。
海外の友達に自分の気持ちを伝えるために手紙を書く。）

４２．英語の勉強をするとき、どうやってそれをやるのかの計画を立てる。

４３．日本にいるとき、授業以外で英語を練習したいと思っていた。

４４．自分が英語で間違えたことを自分の英語の力を伸ばすための参考にしている。

４５．自分で英語の力がどのくらい伸びたかを考えることがある。

Part 4

４６．英語でスピーチをするとき、緊張をほぐすために自分なりにリラックスするようにしている。

４７．リラックスするために音楽を聴きながら勉強する。

４８．リラックスするためにテレビを見ながら勉強する。

４９．自分を励ますために、前向きな言葉を言ったり紙に書いたりしている。

５０．ネイティヴの人と難しい話題で話をしようと努力している。

５１．英語がうまく使えたときやテストがよかったときは自分で自分を誉めたり、励ましたりしている。

５２．英語を勉強したり使ったりしているときに緊張していることが自分でわかる。

５３．自分の英語学習に関しての自分の気持ちや態度、そして動機等についてチェックするためのチェックリストを使っている。

５４．日記に英語学習についての自分の気持ちやその日の感想などを書いている。

５５．英語学習についての悩みを友達と話したりする。

Part 5

５６．もし英語で話しを聞いていてわからないところが出てきたら、その人にゆっくり言うように頼むか、もう一度言ってもらうように頼む。

５７．自分が英語で話すときにネイティヴに間違いをチェックしてもらうように頼む。

５８．他の生徒と英語の練習をする。

５９．ネイティヴからわからないところを教えてもらうように頼む。

６０．英語を話す人たちの文化を学習するようにしている。

６１．ネイティヴの考えや気持ちが解ってきた。

ANSWER SHEET (解答欄)

Choice of your response （選択肢）

1．一度も、またはほとんど一度もしたことがない
2．たまにしたことがある
3．時々したことがある
4．よくする
5．ほとんどいつもする

Part 1

1.___ 2.___ 3.___ 4.___ 5.___ 6.___ 7.___ 8.___ 9.___10.___

11.___12.___13.___14.___15.___16.___17.___18.___19.___20.___

21.____22.____23.____24.____25.____

Part 2

26.____27.____28.____29.____30.____31.____32.____33.____34.____

Part 3

35.___36.___37.___38.___39.___40.___41.___42.___43.___44.___

45.___

Part 4

46.___47.___48.___49.___50.___51.___52.___53.___54.___55.___

Part 5

56.____57.____58.____59.____60.____61.____

Name_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!

B．現在受けている英語強化研修に関しての質問。

下の質問を呼んで指示にしたがって答えて下さい。

1．この英語強化研修を受けて、あなたの勉強方法（学習ストラテジー）はどうなりましたか。あてはまるものに○をつけて下さい。

a) 大きく変わった（2へ進む）b) 少し変わった（2へ進む）
b) 変わらなかった（3へ進む）

2．

2－1 具体的にどう勉強方法（学習ストラテジー）が変わりましたか。a)～g)全ての文を読んであてはまるものに○をつけ、指示に従って答えて下さい。

a) 単語、英語特有の表現、イディオムなどの覚え方が変わった。

① はい（a）-1へ） ②いいえ（b）へ）

a)-1. どのように変わりましたか。具体的に説明して下さい。

_____

_____

_____

b) 授業の受け方（予習、復習、授業の取り組み方等の方法）が変わった。

① はい（b）-1へ） ②いいえ（c）へ）

b)-1どのように変わりましたか。具体的に説明して下さい。

_____

_____

_____

c) わからない単語、英語特有の表現、イディオムが出てきたとき（reading, speaking, listening, writing全ての場合）の対処の仕方が変わった。

① はい（c）-1へ） ②いいえ（d）へ）

c)-1. どのように変わりましたか。具体的に説明して下さい。

_____

_____

_____

d) 授業を受ける態度、勉強をする目的、目標、勉強をするときの計画の立て方、等が変わった。

① はい （d）-1へ） ②いいえ （e）へ）

d)-1. どのように変わりましたか。具体的に説明して下さい。

_____

_____

_____

e) 勉強をしようと思ってもやる気が出ないときの、対処の仕方が変わった。

① はい （e）-1へ） ②いいえ （f）へ）

e)-1. どのように変わりましたか。具体的に説明して下さい。

_____

_____

_____

f) 他の友人、ネイティヴ等と協力しながら勉強するようになった。

① はい （f）-1へ） ②いいえ （g）へ）

f)-1. どのような場合に、どのように協力しながら勉強するようになりましたか。具体的に説明して下さい。

_____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

g) a)〜f) 以外で何か勉強の仕方が変わりましたか。

① はい （g) -1へ） ②いいえ （2—2へ）

g)-1. どのように変わりましたか。具体的に説明して下さい。

_____

_____

_____

2—2 勉強方法が変わったのはなぜだと思いますか。a)〜c) 全ての文を読んで当てはまるものに○をつけ、指示にしたがって答えて下さい。

a) 日本での英語の授業（英文、英米、言語学専攻の人は大学での専門の授業、それ以外専攻の人は高校のときの英語の授業）とこちらでの授業のやり方が変わったから。（クラスの人数の変化も含む）

① はい （a) -1へ） ②いいえ (b) へ）

a)-1 具体的に、日本と比較しながら説明して下さい。

_____

_____

_____

b) 生活環境、学習環境が変わったから。

① はい （b) -1へ） ②いいえ （c) へ）

b)-1. 具体的に、日本と比較しながら説明して下さい。

_____

_____

_____

c) その他の理由のため。

① はい （c) -1へ） ②いいえ （4へ）

c)-1. 具体的に説明して下さい。

_____

_____

_____

3．（勉強方法が変わらなかった人のみ答える）

3—1 勉強方法が変わらなかったのはなぜだと思いますか。a)〜d)の文を読んであてはまるものに○をつけて、指示に従って答えて下さい。

a) 自分で、日本にいるときの勉強方法が自分に合っていると思ったから。

① はい　② いいえ

b) 日本にいるときの勉強方法がこちらの学校でもあっていると思ったから。

① はい　② いいえ

c) 勉強方法を変えるのが、なんとなく面倒だったから。

① はい　② いいえ

d) その他の理由。

① はい（d) -1へ）　② いいえ

d)-1. 具体的に理由を説明して下さい。

_____

_____

_____

4．日本で受けた授業（英文、英米、言語学専攻の人は大学での専門の授業、それ以外の人は高校のときの英語の授業）とここでの授業の違いについて答えて下さい。

日本

a) クラスの規模（人数）— 1クラス ____人

グループ学習をやっていたら、クラスの人数とグループの数、そして
1グループの人数
1クラス ____人 グループの数_____ 1グループの人数____人

b) 先生が授業の中で使用する英語の割合（おおよそ）
該当するものに○をつけて下さい。

ア）0～25% イ）26～50% ウ）51～75% エ）76%～

c) あなたがた生徒が、授業の中で発言（グループ内での相談、議論も含む）する割合（日本語、英語両方含む）（おおよそ）。

ア）0～25% イ）26～50% ウ）51～75% エ）76%～

d) c)の中で英語を使用する割合（おおよそ）
該当するものに○をつけて下さい。

ア）0～25% イ）26～50% ウ）51～75% エ）76%～

e) 授業のやり方（表現できる限りで具体的に説明して下さい。）

_____

_____

_____

_____

こちらでの授業

a) グループの数____ 1グループの人数____人

b) あなたがた生徒が授業の中で発言（グループ内での相談、議論も含む）する割合（日本語、英語両方含む）（おおよそ）。
該当するものに○をつけて下さい。

ア）0～25% イ）26～50% ウ）51～75% エ）76%～

c) b)の中で英語を使用する割合（おおよそ）
該当するものに○をつけて下さい。

ア）0～25% イ）26～50% ウ）51～75% エ）76%～

d) 授業のやり方（表現できる限りで具体的に説明して下さい。）

_____

_____

_____

_____

NAME _____

ご協力ありがとうございました。今後も夏のＩＥＬＥ、秋の学部での活躍を期待しています

YUTAKA TAMADA MAELT LANCASTER UNIVERSITY

F-4

THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

1. Which method did you use in the class? (go to 2)

2. Why did you use 1 in the class? (go to 3)

3. Do you see any distinction between language learning strategies and learning styles? Circle one.

Yes (go to 3-1) No (go to 4)

3-1. What do you see as the distinction? (go to 4)

4. Did you notice any characteristics of JYA students' language learning strategy choices? Circle one.

Yes (go to 4-1) No (go to 5)

4-1. Please explain in detail the characteristics of JYA students' language learning strategy choices. (go to 5)

5. Did you encourage JYA students to use specific language learning strategies? Circle one.

Yes (go to 5-1) No (go to 6)

5-1. What kind of strategy did you encourage them to use? (go to 5-2)

5-2. Please explain in detail how you encouraged them to use specific language learning strategies (go to 6).

6. Do you think that JYA students' language learning strategy choices have changed for this 8 weeks? Circle one.

Yes (go to 6-1) No (it is the end of questionnaire if you chose "No" in Question 3)

6-1. Please explain how JYA students' language learning strategy choices have changed for this 8 weeks? (it is the end of questionnaire if you chose "No" in Question 3)

(Please answer the following questions if you chose "Yes" in Question 3)

7. Did you notice any characteristics of JYA students' learning styles?

Circle one. Yes (go to 7-1) No (go to 8)

7-1. Please explain in detail the characteristics of JYA students' leaning styles. (go to 8)

8. Did you encourage JYA students to use specific learning style?
Circle one.
Yes (go to 8-1) No (go to 9)

8-1. What kind of learning style did you encourage them to use? (go to 8-2)

8-2. Please explain in detail how you encouraged them to use the learning style. (go to 9)

9. Do you think that JYA students' learning styles have changed for this 8 weeks? Circle one

Yes (go to 9-1) No (it is the end of the questionnaire)

9-1. Please explain in detail how they changed their learning styles.
(it is the end of the questionnaire)

NAME_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION!